DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 745 HE 016 725

AUTHOR	Blackwell, James E.
TITLE	Networking and Mentoring: A Study of Cross-Generational Experiences of Blacks in Graduate and Professional Schools.
INSTITUTION	Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE	Jul 83
NOTE	137p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Southern Education Foundation, 811 Cypress Street, Atlanta, GA 30308 ($4.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Black Colleges; *Blacks; Career Ladders; Employment Level; *Graduate Study; Helping Relationship; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; *Interprofessional Relationship; *Mentors; Professional Education; School Location; *Social Networks; Student Teacher Relationship

ABSTRACT

The perceived importance of mentoring and networking to blacks in graduate/professional schools and the effect of the experiences on career advancement were studied. A questionnaire administered to 157 black professionals tested seven hypotheses, including the following: (1) black students' participation in the mentor-protege relationship varies by time and the location of the graduate/professional institution; (2) the younger the person, the less likely a mentor-protege relationship will occur; (3) blacks who attended northern, predominantly-black undergraduate schools or predominantly-white graduate schools are less likely to participate in the mentor-protege relationship than are blacks who attended historically-black undergraduate schools or predominantly-black graduate schools; (4) blacks are more likely to have been involved in a relationship less intensive than mentoring, such as sponsor-student relationship, and advisor-student relationship; (5) blacks who participate in the mentor-protege relationship will show greater career advancement than those blacks who did not have the experience. Analyses of the findings, information on respondent characteristics, a literature review, a discussion of policy implications of the findings, and a bibliography are included. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Networking and Mentoring:
A Study of Cross-Generational Experiences of Blacks in Graduate and Professional Schools

ED235745

HE016725

SEF
SINCE 1867

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Southern Education Foundation
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Southern Education Foundation
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

NETWORKING AND MENTORING: A STUDY OF CROSS-GENERATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF BLACKS IN GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

by

James E. Blackwell
Professor of Sociology
University of Massachusetts/Boston

Southern Education Foundation
811 Cypress Street
Atlanta, Georgia
July, 1983

FOREWORD

The Southern Education Foundation and the family philanthropies which preceded it have had a special and continuing interest in the education of black Americans for more than a hundred years. The Foundation has been concerned particularly with programs aimed at increasing and improving higher education opportunities for blacks in the South.

In April, 1974, the SEF Board of Directors established a special project, the Higher Education Program, to address issues which were surfacing as a result of the then Adams v. Richardson case. Under this higher education component, the Foundation supported coalitions formed by citizens to monitor state desegregation plans, sponsored conferences and workshops, published papers, monographs and documents, and awarded general grants which focused specifically on achieving equity in higher education in the ten states affected by the Adams case.

In September, 1978, the Higher Education Program proposed concentrating a major portion of its allocation on a Research Task Force which was formed to plan a research agenda for the Foundation and to commission research projects. This body of six educators has commissioned 17 studies since its inception; this document is presented as the eighth of the research efforts. The first report, A STUDY OF TITLE III IMPACT ON HISTORICALLY BLACK INSTITUTIONS, written by Dr. Cameron Fincher, Institute of Higher Education, University of Georgia, is available to the public at no cost. The following reports may be purchased from the Foundation for $4.00 each: RECENT COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY ENROLLMENT PATTERNS OF BLACK STUDENTS IN STATES AFFECTED BY ADAMS-CALIFANO LITIGATION, written by Dr. William Brazziel, University of Connecticut, and Marian Brazziel, Mansfield Center, Connecticut; ACCESS, RETENTION AND PROGRESSION OF BLACK STUDENTS THROUGH THE TWO-TIER FLORIDA HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM, by Dr. Charles M. Grigg, Florida State University, Institute of Social Research; BLACK EMPLOYEES IN TRADITIONALLY WHITE INSTITUTIONS IN THE ADAMS STATES: 1975 to 1977, by Dr. Anne S. Pruitt, Ohio State University; DETERMINING THE COLLEGE DESTINATION OF BLACK STUDENTS, by Dr. Gail E. Thomas and Dr. Jomills Henry Braddock II, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University; FACTORS RELATED TO THE POSTBACCALAUREATE CAREERS OF BLACK GRADUATES OF SELECTED FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS IN ALABAMA, by Dr. Rhoda Barge Johnson, Tuskegee Institute; and, COPING STRATEGIES: RETAINING BLACK STUDENTS IN COLLEGE, by Yvonne Abatso, Langston Urban Center, Tulsa.

Copies of this report and subsequent publications will be available at a cost of $4.00 each.

Thank you.

Southern Education Foundation
311 Cypress Street, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308
(404) 881-0875; 881-8017

August, 1983

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses sincere appreciation to the Southern Education Foundation (SEF) for sponsoring this research, to Karima Al-Amin of SEF and to the members of its Research Task Force for their thoughtful criticism of the first draft of the data collection instrument. Gratitude is also expressed to several persons for their assistance in various stages of this project: (1) my colleagues who also evaluated the original questionnaire; Russell Schutt, Gerald Garrett, Gregory Johnson, Siamak Movahedi and Philip Hart; (2) the black professionals who participated in the study, without whose timely cooperation this study would not have been possible; (3) the invaluable services as statistical consultants provided by my colleagues, Obie Clayton and Russell Schutt; (4) programming and data assistance provided by Obie Clayton, Debbie Rittner and John Murphy of the Computer Center of the University of Massachusetts/Boston; (5) Drs. Rodney Reed, Darryl Greer, Alma H. Young, and William Brazziel contributed to the identification of potential participants in the study; (6) Zaki A. Sakin served as my research assistant; (7) Barbara Saulnier assisted in the preparation of the data, and (8) the entire manuscript was typed by Anne Foxx-Knight.

My profound gratitude and appreciation are expressed to Myrt, my wife, for her timely advice, encouragement and support throughout all phases of this research.

Table of Contents

		Page
List of Tables		i
Chapter I	Introduction	1
Chapter II.	Review of Pertinent Literature Characteristics of Mentors Functions of Mentors Selection Networking Objectives of Study	6
Chapter III.	Design and Methodology Description of Instrument Universe and Sampling Frame Non-Respondents Variables Characteristics of Respondents Limitations of Study	19
Chapter IV.	Data Analysis and Findings: Networking Social Networks Friends Time Spent Acquaintance Volume Social Life Network Scale and Correlates Suggested Hypotheses	41
Chapter V.	Black Faculty, Role Models and Mentoring Black Faculty Role Models Characteristics of Most Important Person Mentoring and Blacks: Correlates After Degree Attainment Suggested Hypotheses	88
Chapter VI.	Policy Implications	117
Bibliography		121
Appendix A - The Questionnaire		126

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Age of Respondents	33
2.	Marital Status of Respondents	33
3.	State of Births of Respondents	34
4.	Type of Undergraduate College	35
5.	Characteristics of Institutions from Which Highest Degree Was Received by Number and Percent	36
6.	Respondents by Highest Degree Received, Number and Percent	38
7.	Number of Respondents by Major in Professional School and Percent	38
8.	Context in Which Closest Friends Were Met by Type, Number and Percent	43
9.	Race of Closest Friends While In Graduate or Professional School	45
10.	Relationship With Friendship Groups After Graduation	45
11.	Acquaintance Volume by Characteristics of Institution From Which Highest Degree Was Received	47
12.	Acquaintance Volume by Education	48
13.	Acquaintance Volume by Collaboration With Friends From Graduate or Professional School	49
14.	Degree of Importance of Selected Factors in Creating A Positive Social Life While in Graduate or Professional School	52
15.	Functions Performed by Graduate/Professional School Friends by Number and Percent in Degrees of Importance	55
16.	Networking by Sex	56
17.	Network Types by Age Cohorts, Number and Percent (Age Cohort Based Upon Period Undergraduate Degree Received)	57
18.	Networking by Type of Undergraduate Institution, Number and Percent	59
19.	Networking Related to Type of Graduate/Professional Institution, by Number and Percent	60
20.	Networking By Relations With Closest Graduate and Professional School Friends, Number and Percent	62
21.	Networking By Relations With Persons Characterized As Close But Not Intimate Friends in Graduate/Professional School, Number and Percent	62
22.	Networking By Collaboration With Graduate and Professional School Friends in Professional Activities, Number and Percent	63
23.	Networking and Career Influence by Number, Percent and Race of Friends	63
24.	Networking Related to Acquaintance Volume	64
25.	Acquaintance Volume By Race of Graduate or Professional Institution, Number and Percent	65
26.	Strength of Ties by Sex, Number and Percent	67
27.	Relationship Between Ties and Age Cohorts Measured By Period Baccalaureate Degree Received, Number and Percent	69
28.	Ties By Collaboration on Professional Endeavors With Graduate or Professional School Friends, Number and Percent	70
29.	TIES By Occupational Status, Number and Percent Types of Present Occupation-Highest Positions Attained	71
30.	Presence or Absence of Black Faculty in Respondents' Major Department or Field of Study by Number and Percent	89

Table		Page
31.	Number of Role Models Reported While in Graduate or Professional School by Percent	92
32.	Most Significant Role Models While in Graduate or Professional School by Race, Field, Number and Percent	92
33.	Faculty Role in Development While in Graduate or Professional School, Number and Percent	93
34.	Relationship With Faculty While in Graduate or Professional School, Number and Percent	93
35.	Mentoring by Age Cohort. Number and Percent	98
36.	Mentoring by Period in Which Highest Degree Awarded	98
37.	Mentoring By Location and Racial Characteristics of Undergraduate Institution	100
38.	Mentoring By Racial Characteristics of Graduate or Professional School	100
39.	Mentoring by Occupational Status, Number and Percent	103
40.	Most Important Person in Graduate/Professional School By Race, Sex, Number and Percent	111
41.	Age of Most Important Person in Graduate or Professional School by Number and Percent	112
42.	Relationship between Mentoring and Ties	113

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The underrepresentation of black students in graduate and professional schools and in the professions has received considerable attention in recent years (Berrian, 1982; Blackwell, 1975, 1977, 1981, 1982; Morris, 1979; and Thomas, 1981). In general, these studies tracked enrollment patterns and graduation rates of black students over specific time frames. In some instances trend data were provided which permitted comparisons of enrollment and graduation rates between significant time frames such as between the pre-Brown v. Board of Education period and the 1970s. A commonality to these studies is the conclusion that, despite increasing access, there is a critical shortage of black students enrolled in professional schools and doctoral degree programs. Reference is also made to the impact of the learning environment within institutional structures and the role of mentoring on the retention of black students (Miller and Brinkman, 1982), the quality of performance while in graduate and/or professional school, and the motivation of black students to select certain types of careers following graduation (Blackwell, 1981).

Some attention has also been given to the underrepresentation of minority and women faculty at all professional levels in higher education and the implications of this situation for the presence or absence of visible role models for black students (Hochschild, 1974; Pruitt, 1981; Wilson, 1982). Anne Pruitt, for instance, points to the maldistribution of black and women faculty members at all professional levels in institutions of higher learning in selected states under the "Adams" litigation. Her study demonstrates the inordinate concentration of both groups at the lower rungs of the professional hierarchy and to the failure of institutions to retain black faculty members by tenuring them (Pruitt, 1981).

Despite the existence of affirmative action guidelines for higher education since 1972, minorities are rarely hired in high level academic and administrative positions in colleges and universities unless they are in historically or predominantly black institutions. This assertion is supported by findings of a study conducted by the American Council on Education for the College and University Personnel Association. This study of 26,104 administrators employed at 1,222 institutions in 1978-79 revealed the continuing domination of white males and the underrepresentation of white women and blacks at all high level administrative positions in American colleges and universities. At the time of this survey, white males held 94.9 percent of the position of Chief Executive Officer; 81.5 percent of the Administrative Officer positions; 81.9 percent of the Academic Affairs jobs, and 74.6 percent of the top positions in Student Affairs. By contrast, "minority men" in similar institutions held only 4.0 percent of the Chief Executive Officer positions; they comprised 5.7 percent of the Chief Administrative Officers; they held a mere 3.7 percent of the Chief Academic Affairs positions, and 6.3 percent of the top positions in Student Affairs. In general, white women were more likely to have greater representation than either minority men or women (College and University Personnel Association, 1981:10).

The continuing maldistribution and underrepresentation of black women and men in teaching and administrative roles in the predominantly white institutions may be explained by the persistence of discriminatory hiring policies in some institutions and systems; by the underproduction of black doctorates in certain specialized fields of study, and by individual choices in selecting positions available to them. Irrespective of the reasons for this situation, a major consequence is the infrequency of black mentors, sponsors and advisors available to black students enrolled in graduate and professional schools. This underrepresentation of black faculty and administrators also means that black students may have restricted choices in the selection of "significant others" after whom career choices may be modeled. They may have limited options or opportunities in the selection of individuals who may help guide their development as students and who may facilitate their career development.

The point is not that white professors do not serve as role models or as mentors to black students. In fact, many white professors serve effectively in this role even when black students may have a choice between white and black professors for this function. In other instances, due to the gross underrepresentation of black faculty in graduate and professional schools, white professors may be the only persons available on campus to perform mentoring, sponsoring and advising functions. Neither is the point to argue that black professors are expected to be role models, mentors, sponsors or advisors "for black students only;" they, too, should be available to all students; in fact many black professors perform a variety of modeling and mentoring functions for white students as well as for black and other minority students. However, if they are not hired by institutions, all students--blacks, whites, minorities, men and women--are restricted in their choices of faculty and administrators available to perform important, developmental and educational functions. It is self-evident, nevertheless, that the options are greater for white students than for blacks and other racial minorities. The absence of faculty and administrators who are interested in the developmental aspects of a student's graduate or professional school life many have far-reaching implications for both the quality of the students's learning environment and for career advancement after graduation.

Another highly salient factor in the overall quality of life among graduate and professional school students is the network system operative in institutions of higher learning. As amplified in the next section, there is a growing body of literature on the value of networks for facilitating educational development, a good sense of well-being, and for understanding how to maneuver the system in ways that reduce obstructions to goal attainment. There is also some evidence that many black students feel isolated and excluded from social and educational networks that are available to white students and that that exclusion had a negative impact on their subsequent evaluation of graduate and professional school experiences (Blackwell, 1981). It is often assumed that networks formed in educational institutions may be a strong determinant of subsequent career development and patterns. If black students are excluded from student social and educational networks and if they are not included in the networks spawned by mentor-protegé relationships, their movement "through and up" in the world of professionals may be impeded and, perhaps, unnecessarily traumatic.

Neither mentoring nor networking occurs in a vacuum. Each is a systematic process. The relationships developed within mentoring and networking are developmental and dynamic. These relationships are, therefore, components of a larger environmental context prevalent both within the institutional setting and in the type of community in which the institution is located. How mentoring functions are performed and how social networks are constructed may be extensions of both desegregation and access to higher education.

Hence, desegregation of the higher education enterprise and enhancing opportunities to enroll in graduate and professional schools may be only a necessary precondition to an equally important configuration of developmental processes vital for greater student satisfaction, retention, and advancement into the world of professionals. Once enrolled in graduate or professional school, black students may or may not be as "satisfied" as white students with the quality of their lives (Robertson, 1974). The degree of their satisfaction may be a manifestation of the continuity and discontinuity or compatibility and incompatibility between "participant role expectations and organizational role requirements" (Van Den Berg, 1975:262). Black students, like other students, enter into graduate or professional training with certain expectations regarding the social and educational environment within their selected institutions. These expectations may or may not be altered or transformed by: (1) the nature of their social interactions, (2) their socialization into institutional norms, (3) their ability to establish and maintain rewarding relationships with their professors and possibly, with administrators who may be instrumental in meeting some of their needs, or (4) by the quality of interpersonal relations they establish and maintain with their peers. Hence, their "satisfaction" may be expressions of the power of their formal training to facilitate overall development (Carter, 1974) or reflective of the quality of their formal and informal networks, and perceptions of the substantive contributions of mentoring processes in their educational development.

The primary research problem here is the perceived salience of mentoring and networking for the experiences of black students while enrolled in graduate or professional schools, and the degree to which mentoring and networking are perceived as important contributors to subsequent career development and advancement.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF PERTINENT LITERATURE

Perhaps coincidentally, the current interest in mentoring as a process of immense importance in educational development and career advancement appeared to have coincided with the increasing access of blacks, minorities and white women to graduate and professional education. However, until the 1970s, most of the literature focused on the salience of mentoring for the advancement of white men through systems of higher education and in the occupational structure. Little attention was devoted to the value of mentoring for minorities and women. However, with the entry of minorities and women, especially white women, into educational and occupational systems, combined with evidence of apparent difficulties these groups experienced in achieving educational and occupational aspirations, more attention was devoted to their experiences or lack of contact with mentors (Epstein, 1971, Fowler, 1982; Haseltine, 1977; Kanter, 1977; Shapiro, et al., 1978, Levinson, 1978; Lynch, 1980; Moore, 1982; Phillips-Jones, 1982; Taylor-McLaughlin, 1982). Despite this renewed interest in mentoring, there is a paucity of empirical studies that focus on mentoring for black and other minority students.

Conceptual clarity is lacking with respect to a precise delineation of what constitutes mentoring and of how mentoring is differentiated from other functions performed by persons labeled "sponsors," "advisors," or "guides." Confusion in defining mentoring is so pervasive in academe and in the world of professionals that it is as if when asked to define the term, the response is "I know it when I experience it but I can't tell you what it is." Nevertheless, several recent researchers have attempted to explain mentoring, specify functions performed by mentors, delineate specific characteristics of mentoring and to address the problems involved in selecting a mentor, or those associated with the individual's selection as a protegé or mentee (Fowler, 1982; Klopf and Harrison, 1982; Phillips-Jones, 1982; Levinson, 1978; Lynch, 1980; Moore, 1982; and Taylor-McLaughlin, 1982). Attempts to bring conceptual clarity to the mentoring process reveal its immense complexity and diversity.

It is complex because of its formal and informal structural components. Role relationships may affect patterns similar to those implicit in parenting such as authority, respect, intimacy and trust. It is in this sense that Levinson (1978), for instance, suggests that "mentoring is defined not in terms of formal roles but in terms of the character of the relationships and the functions it serves" (Levinson, 1978:97). Mentors may also be perceived as important persons who influence others professionally (Fowler, 1982). This view is similar to the definition advanced by Phillips-Jones (1982:20) who claims that "mentors are influential people who significantly help you reach your major life goals."

Characteristics of Mentors: Implicit in most definitions of mentors is the assumption that certain explicit attributes or characteristics are associated with persons who serve in this capacity. One notion is that mentors are usually of the same gender and race (Levinson, 1978). Perhaps, one explanation for this assumption lies in the paucity of literature and/or empirical studies devoted to the availability of mentors for minorities and women or on the subject of cross-gender and cross-racial mentor-protegé relationships. For instance, shortages of female mentors may be attributed to their scarcity and exclusion from high level academic and managerial and professional positions (Levinson, 1978:79). The same factors may account for the scarcity of same-race and same-sex mentors among blacks in these situations.

In agreement with Levinson's position, other researchers claim that mentors are likely to be (several years) older than the protegé or mentee, have much greater experiences, seniority and influence, to be occupants of high level positions and power. They have a commitment to the developmental aspects of the protegé's life (Levinson, 1978 and Lynch, 1980:45). However, others claim that, while mentors are usually older than protegés, in some instances and special circumstances, they may be younger than the protegé (Phillips-Jones, 1982:20). The latter situation seems more likely when the mentor-protegé relationship is task-specific and is designed for a specific time frame (Phillips-Jones, 1982). If, indeed, the relationship is simply a matter of a specific task to be performed or only for limited duration, it may be questionable as to whether or not the term mentor is the correct or appropriate characterization of such relationships. Other terms, such as "sponsor," facilitator," or "promotor" may be more effective in capturing and describing the quality of such relationships in terms of the functions performed.

Functions of Mentors: Persons who serve as mentors usually perform an immense array of functions for the protegé the institutions or agencies they serve and for whom the protegé is in preparation to serve. These functions include: (1) providing training for students, (2) stimulating the acquisition of knowledge, (3) providing much needed information about their educational programs, (4) emotional support and encouragement to students, (5) socializing the student/protegé into the role requirements, expectations, and organizational imperative or demands of the profession, (6) socializing the protegé into the benefits of the profession, (7) helping the protegé in the development of a personal ethic, (8) socializing or creating an understanding of the requirements for successful maneuverability of the educational bureaucracies, (9) assisting the protegé in the development of coping strategies during period of training to become a professional, (10) socializing the protegé into the mentor's own professional and social network in order to facilitate the development of contacts requisite to career advancement, (11) writing letters of recommendation, making contacts for possible job opportunities for the protegé (12) teaching the protegé about the internal politics of the training milieu as well as that of the occupational network, (13) informal instructions about etiquette and appropriate dress for social occasions, (14) assisting the protegé in making contacts through travel to professional meetings and through collaboration on research, (15) building self-confidence in the protegé and establishing a relationship of mutual trust as a precursor for other situations and other scholarly pursuits in which the mentor may be involved, (16) defending and protecting protegés under attack and (17) enhancing the protegé's career (Brin and Wheeler, 1966; Cameron and Blackburn, 1981; Collins and Scott, 1978; de Solla and Beaver, 1966; Epstein and Kanter, 198 ; Fowler, 1982; Hennig and Jardim, 1977; Kanter, 1977; Klopf and Harrison, 1982; Moore, 1982; Roche, 1979; and Speizer, 1981).

Daniel Levinson identified six major functions of mentors: (1) "they serve as teachers who enhance skills and intellectual development," (2) they serve as "sponsors" who use their influence to "facilitate ... advancement," (3) they may be "guides" who socialize the protegé into "a new occupational and social world with new values, resources and actors, (4) they are "exemplars" who may be emulated by the protegé, (5) they act as "counselors" and support structures for protegés "in times of stress," and (6) they facilitate the "realization of the dream" (Levinson, 1978:98).

Implicit in Levinson's formulation is the assumption that role models are positive in their impact on the development of those who seek to emulate them. This position is called into serious question by some researchers who argue that, in the case of women, "role models are of limited effectiveness in assisting women to gain positions of leadership, authority, or power" (Shapiro, Haseltine and Roe, 1978; Haseltine, 1977). Labeling the concept of role modeling as a "sociological dinosaur," Haseltine claims that "female role models may inhibit women's advancement" (Haseltine, 1977). This argument is based on the proposition that those professional women who have actually "made it" have done so under circumstances and conditions quite different from those conditions facing women currently entering the profession (Hazeltine, 1977). The conditions that made it possible, probable or difficult for persons to achieve success in one time frame or in one social context may not necessarily be the same as those that affect advancement or "moving through and up" into the world of professionals in another context. Hence, it is necessary to take into consideration such factors as time, social context, institutional demands made upon potential mentors and role models, and internal and external pressures when assessing the relative salience of role models and mentors for the development of graduate and professional students.

The issue of time demands made upon potential role models and mentors is discussed by James E. Blackwell, Maurice Jackson and Joan Moore with respect to the position of minority group sociologists in the profession. They point out that, in all too many situations, minority group sociologists find themselves in teaching positions in which they are the only member of their group in a department or in a division, college or other academic unit within the university. Consequently, they are expected to be stimulating and provocative teachers, productive scholars, extremely active in community affairs and to serve the needs of all students from the respective minority group. In other words, "everything black, and problems affecting black students are automatically directed toward the lone black member of the department" (Blackwell, Jackson and Moore, 1976).

Because of commitment and/or the belief that devoting so much time to "things black" reflect normative departmental, collegiate or university expectations, the lone black member forges ahead on the service and support roles which sometime approximate mentoring functions, with the expectation that this function will be rewarded during tenure evaluations. Blackwell and associates found little support for the contention that such activities are actually rewarded. Quite the contrary, the lone minority assistant professor is often denied tenure on the grounds of insufficient scholarly productivity. No consideration is given to the enormous investment of time in non-scholarly but extremely vital functions which all but precluded a high rate of productivity. Hence, black and other minority professors who could be important role models and mentors traverse the proverbial revolving door. Fears of the negative reward structure might surface as an impediment to mentoring among some members of minority groups who hold faculty positions. Yet, they may still remain as role models for some students.

In fact, some persons may serve as role models without ever knowing that they were so characterized, consciously or unconsciously, by students. There is also some evidence that many students do not focus exclusively on a single person for role modeling; they pick and choose from an array of persons those particular traits which they admire, incorporate them into their own identities, and select two or more persons as "partial models" (Bucher and Stelling, 1977). It is important, therefore, to keep in mind that role models may or may not become mentors.

As stressed by Levinson, mentoring is indeed a complex phenomenon. This view is shared by Eileen Shapiro and associates who also characterized mentoring as "intense and paternalistic." Others elaborate on this conceptualization with such depictions as "a system of professional patronage and sponsorship" (Epstein, Lorber, and Hall, cited in Sharpiro, et al., 1977:333; C. Epstein, 1971; O. Hall, 1966). According to Shapiro, et al., beneficiaries in this system of patrons and sponsors are counseled, advised, guided, protected, and championed. This system involves mentors, sponsors, guides and peer pals. Mentors and peer pals are at opposite poles on a continuum. Sponsors appear about two-thirds toward the top, positioned below mentors and above guides who appear about one-third from the lower end of the continuum (Shapiro, et al., 1977).

The most powerful and influential persons within this system of patrons are the mentors. Sponsors are also strong patrons but they are less powerful in relationship to mentors. This difference is especially observable in terms of ability to promote and shape the careers of protegés. Guides are even less capable of championing, protecting and dispensing rewards to protegés than either the sponsor or the mentor. Yet, guides may play a highly important function -- they may "point out the pitfalls to be avoided and shortcuts to be pursued, and... provide intelligence to their protegés" (Shapiro, et al., 1977:55). Shapiro also uses the concept of "peer-pals" to "describe the relationship between peers helping each other to succeed and progress" (Shapiro, et al., 1977:56). Reciprocity is the cornerstone of peer-pal relationships. They share information and strategies. They are mutual sounding boards; they give advice to one another; they confide and they commiserate.

The mentor-protegé dyad is often an emotionally charged, "professionally paternalistic" structure, especially as it relates to training, success, and mobility. The paternalistic dynamic may reflect the conscious or subconscious tendency of mentors to reproduce themselves in their protegés, "re-making the person in his/her own image," as it were. It may also suggest over-identification; that is, an effort by the mentor to produce a protegé who achieves what he/she did not or could not achieve. However, the protegé must first be *chosen* or *selected* and the mentor must agree to perform that role(s).

Selection: Not everyone is chosen as a protegé. Potential protegés sometimes encounter extreme difficulty in locating or finding a mentor. Even if they find a mentor, some individuals do not experience mentoring relationships qualitatively beneficial as those evidenced by some of their peers. There is some evidence that important determinants in the selection equation between mentors and protegés are essentially ascriptions such as race, social class, gender and religion (O. Hall, 1966; Moore, 1982). Blacks, women and students from less favored social class positions may encounter difficulty in being selected as a protegé or in finding a mentor/sponsor or guide.

Other research suggests that effective mentoring involves at least seven critical elements: (1) the "accessibility" of the mentor to the protegé, this is a question of both the amount of time spent with the protegé as well as the quality of the relationship established during that time, (2) "visibility," or the degree to which opportunities are provided for the protegé to become known in the profession, (3) "feedback," or periodic and timely information provided the protegé about his/her strengths and weaknesses, (4) "recognition," or a genuine commitment to the process itself and to enhancing opportunities for protegé success, (5) "allowance for failure" or how to bow out of the relationship with as little trauma as possible, (6) "openness" in the slection of students in order to permit access to the mentoring process by students who are different from the mentor in terms of such ascriptive features as race, sex, class and religion, and (7) "commitment" to the protegé with respect to goal attainment and career development (Moore, 1982).

The apparent complexity of the mentoring process and the enormity of role requirements or expectations of mentors themselves suggest that it is difficult for many persons to be characterized as a mentor in the pure sense of the term. Therefore, degrees of mentoring and variations in the success experienced by participants in the mentor-protegé relationship are not unexpected. Although the typology provided by Shapiro and associates may not be an accurate characterization of reality, it is an invaluable heuristic structure which illuminates kinds of distinctions possible in understanding what happens when potential mentors and potential protegés interact in the graduate and professional school environ.

Networking: The term, "networking" is in common usage today among academicians, students, and other professionals in the world of work. It is defined as "a process of building contacts to enhance job search and success" (Javonovich and Tanguay, 1980:31); "the sharing of information and the creation of personal linkages" (Green, 1982:17); "an exchange...based on favors, loyalties and personal influence" (Pancrazio and Gray, 1982:17), and as "today's go-go term for the systematic process of using contacts to further our own career or business ends," (Moses, 1980:29). In the study of the production of black professionals, the author observed in interview data that many black students referred to the need for strong networks while in graduate and professional schools (Blackwell, 1981). Special attention was called repeatedly to the reciprocal roles and benefits that could accrue from the formation, maintenance and strengthening of close network ties. Needs and benefits ranged from the desire for information exchange, intellectual discourse and educational dialogue, to academic support, honing of academic skills, social interaction and companionship. Hence, there was an expression of need for broad-based social networks.

Networking as a social phenomenon has not received the sustained attention it deserves. In terms of sociological theory it has always been somewhat peripheral to the discipline of sociology (Granovetter, 1978:1360). Similarly, comparatively little attention was even given to sociometry, the precursor of network analysis. This situation may be explained partly in terms of the identification of network analysis and sociometry with social psychology and in part as a function of the "inherent complexities of network analysis" (Granovetter, 1978:1360).

Networking involves and necessitates certain basic understandings including interpretations of acquaintance volume, network density, and network ties. Granovetter defines "acquaintance volume" as "the average number of people known by each person." It is a question of how many people do you know which, in turn, is a manifestation of social contacts, and may be suggestive of the degree to which individuals are socially integrated or exist as social isolates. Network density, as explained by Granovetter, refers to "the ratio of the number of ties actually observed to the number theoretically possible" (Granovetter, 1976). It may be a measure of soical cohesion and it may be, as Homans posited, a "partial indication of the extent to which the group" is characterized as primary or closed (Homans, 1950; Granovetter, 1976). Network ties refer to the social bonding between two or more actors.

It is generally assumed that network ties are strong; however, some may be weak, and there may be "strength in weak ties." Granovetter argues that "the strength of a tie is a combination of the amount of time, the emotional intensity, the intimacy (mutual confiding), and the reciprocal services which characterize the tie" (Granovetter, 1976:1278). In other words, these four elements play an essential role in determining the "strength" of interpersonal ties. There may be also what anthropologists call "multiplexity;" that is, multiple contexts in a relationship as indicating a strong tie (Granovetter, 1976). There is an element of interdependency involved in networking which suggests an important principle of diffusion of influence and information and mobility opportunity as expectations of peer relationships.

It is also important to know something about the process of establishing initial ties and contacts and how people begin to share (diffuse) pertinent information between them. Are initial ties established as a consequence of what Stanley Milgram describes as the "small-world" notion ("the typical comment of newly introduced individuals who discover common acquaintances"), or enforced circumstances (Milgram, 1967)? If blacks attend predominantly white graduate and professional schools, what are the chances of their establishing strong network ties, friendship linkages and a sufficient acquaintance volume that will enhance their goals, social mobility and career development?

How often do members of social networks interact with each other? George Homans argues in The Human Group that "the more frequently persons interact with one another, the stronger the sentiments of friendship with one another are apt to be" (Homans, 1950:133). More frequent interaction leads to a greater velocity of transmission or greater diffusion of information among members of a social network. Obviously, that interaction which is of initial importance here is that which occurs within the network system. This system includes both the "effective" network in which interaction between actors is characterized by regularity and an "extended" network in which interactions may be important but nonetheless more casual and less frequent (A. Epstein, 1969). The effective network, if involving few friends, may encapsulate the individual, especially in terms of knowledge of the world beyond one's immediate circle of friends. The establishment of effective and extended networks may very well be a function of intra-racial acquaintance volume, inter-racial acquaintance volume, and generalized network density. These, in turn, may be expressive of the quality of the overall institutional climate, attitudinal constructs, and sense of psychological well-being of the actor within the graduate and professional school environment.

The establishment and maintenance of effective and extended networks may be as influential on subsequent career development, professionalization, and expanded occupational opportunities as mentors. Similarly, just as the pattern of mentoring and exposure of students to mentoring may be conditioned by time and social conditions, the same may be true for networking. For instance, blacks of one generation may be able to establish stronger effective and extended networks by virtue of the friendships and contacts developed within graduate and professional schools than are blacks during another time and location.

However, the capacity to establish viable networks, as stated above, may be contingent upon the existence of a critical mass - a sufficient number of students who wish to create linkages -- volume, density, and a sense of purpose. Because of the inordinately small numbers of blacks enrolled in some institutions or in some professional or graduate programs, the connectedness required for the creation of networks may be missing. This situation is further exacerbated by the exclusion of blacks from white student networks. Nevertheless, whenever blacks do establish networks in graduate schools, these social networks may assume some of the functions ascribed to mentors, especially in those instances in which blacks are excluded from participating in a mentor-protegé relationship.

Objectives of the Study

The first objective of this exploratory study is to seek possible answers to the following questions.

1. To what extent are black students, across generational lines and time sequences, selected as protegés and/or are able to choose mentors?
2. To what degree is the mentor-protegé dyad which involves black students as the protegé similar or different by institutional

types and by the region of the country in which it occurs?

3. What is the impact of mentoring on the development of the black protegé at various stages in the relationship (e.g., in school, ("moving through"), job selection, occupational choices ("moving up"), choice of internship sites, subsequent career advancement, etc.)?
4. In what way does networking influence "moving through" and "moving up" in the educational system and in the world of professionals?
5. Are different generations of blacks more or less likely to be influenced by mentors? sponsors? guides? or peer-pals?
6. Is networking constrained by the factor of race, time and generation?
7. What are the implications of this research for educational policy?

A second study objective is to generate hypotheses that may ultimately test the relative differences in the impact of mentoring and networking between white and black students of the same generations, time, and field of study.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

It was noted earlier on that this exploratory study seeks to shed light on the salience of networks and mentors for black graduate and professional school students. Another purpose is to assess the degree to which the networks and mentoring relationships formed while in graduate and/or professional school impact on subsequent career advancement or development. In this regard, seven preliminary hypotheses were delineated for testing; namely,

1. The participation of black students in the mentor-protegé relationship varies by time and the location of the institution in which graduate/professional training was received;
2. The younger the person, the less likely is participation in the mentor-protegé relationship;
3. Blacks who received undergraduate degrees from northern, predominantly white institutions are less likely to participate in the mentor-protege relationship than are blacks who received undergraduate degrees from historically black colleges;
4. Blacks who attended a predominantly black graduate/professional school are more likely to have participated in the mentor-protegé relationship than are blacks who were graduated from a predominantly white graduate/professional school;
5. In general, blacks are less likely to participate in mentoring-protegé dyad and are more likely to have been involved in a relationship less intensive than mentoring, such as sponsor-student relationship, and advisor-student relationship, or, perhaps, to have relied heavily upon other persons (administrators, community members, or peers);

6. Blacks who did participate in the mentor-protegé relationship will show greater career advancement with respect to career development (i.e., reported present occupations) than those blacks who did not have that experience, and
7. Strong network ties are equally effective in moving persons through and up in the system of professionals as is participation in the mentor-protegé dyad.

Description of Instrument

A preliminary questionnaire was constructed and circulated to a panel of twelve experts for critical appraisal. Their comments led to revisions in the original instrument and to the construction of a 57-item pre-coded instrument which was further pre-tested on ten persons. This questionnaire contained thirty-nine (39) closed and eighteen (18) open-ended items.

The items included in the questionnaire sought: (1) general background information (e.g., sex, marital status, state of birth, age, highest degree obtained, year that both undergraduate and graduate or professional degrees were obtained, types of institutions attended, specific name of both undergraduate and graduate/professional institution, and major while in graduate or professional school); (2) information concerning transfer or movement between black and white institutions, (3) occupational data, (4) networking data, (5) information on role models, if any, (6) information about relationships with "most important person while in graduate/professional school" (i.e., possible mentor, sponsor or advisor), (7) qualitative and quantitative information about the relationship between the "most important person" while in school and in subsequent career development, and (8) special comments that the respondents wished to make.

Response categories permitted some items to be dichotomized; others to be trichotomized, and still others, continuous. The questionnaire items were constructed to permit easy stratification of the sample along those dimensions that were critical to the hypotheses posed for investigation and for other analyses that might generate additional hypotheses.

Universe and Sampling Frame

At the onset of this study, it was intended to establish a sample of black professionals based upon traditional probability sampling procedures. Specifically, the universe of study, in a strict sense, would have been all active black physicians, dentists, lawyers, engineers, social workers, pharmacists, veterinarians, optometrists, and holders of the doctoral degree in the United States. Theoretically, the names of these individuals could be drawn from rosters kept by black professional organizations such as the National Medical Association, the National Bar Association, the National Council of Black Social Workers, the Associations of Black Sociologists, Economists, Psychologists, Anthropologists, the National Dental Association, and other similar organizations. The acquisition of such rosters would have facilitated randominization procedures that would have permitted the inclusion of representatives from all these groups in a selected probability sample.

Not only was the procedure exceptionally costly had it been operationalized, it was unfeasible in terms of the prospects of obtaining the kind of cooperation from the professional organizations required. In fact, the official policy of most of these organizations prevents executive officers from releasing the names of their members. Consequently, an alternative method for selecting possible respondents was devised. This second approach involved selecting what was essentially a snowball sample drawn from a combination of sources. Four possible sources of respondents were identified:

1. the roster of participants in the First National Conference of Black Administrators on White College Campuses, held at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in late June, 1982;
2. the roster of participants in the Annual Conference of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (NAFEO), held in Washington, D.C. in March, 1982;
3. the roster of participants in the Conference on Current Research in Career Advancement: The Position of Black Americans," sponsored by the National Urban League, and held in Atlanta, Georgia in early June, 1982, and
4. nominations made by black professionals (knowledgeable about other black professionals) who resided in Washington, D.C.; Cleveland, Ohio; New Orleans, Louisiana; Houston, Texas; San Francisco-Berkeley, California; and New Haven-Storrs, Connecticut.

These sources produced 956 names from which a sample could be drawn. Inasmuch as all types of black professionals existing in the total black population were not likely to attend such conferences or, perhaps, not equally known to the informant-professionals, the rules of probability sampling were not strictly followed. Nevertheless, an effort was made to adhere to important sampling principles through randomly selecting possible participants from the list of 956 potential participants. A twenty-two (22) percent sample was drawn from this list of 956. In other words, 226 names were selected, and the 57-item questionnaire was mailed to each person in July, 1982.

The first mailing resulted in responses from 109 persons within two weeks. The second mailing occurred one week later and resulted in 27 respondents. The third mailing in early September produced an additional ten respondents. In addition, nine questionnaires were returned for "insufficient address," "moved and left no forwarding address," or "not at this address." The three mailings generated 146 cases or a 66 percent return rate. Of this number, four were discarded as unusable because of an insufficient number of items answered, or because the person had not completed college, or did not hold a professional degree. The sample was enlarged to 157 cases as a result of the direct administration of the questionnaire to fifteen third-year graduating seniors from the Law Schools of Southern University and Harvard University. As a result, 157 cases are represented in the study. In depth interviews were conducted with five persons as a means of expanding on some of the more personal and qualitative issues associated with experiences of black professionals with the networking and mentoring process.

Non-Respondents: Approximately thirty percent of the persons in the sample failed to respond. As argued by Forcese and Richer (1970), this problem is one that cannot be easily dismissed in survey research. There is always the possibility that non-respondents might be too numerous and radically different from the remainder of the selected sample. If so, bias could be a major problem (Forcese and Richer, 1970:191). In this study, the response rate of approximately seventy percent is well within the bounds of acceptability for mailed questionnaires (Blalock, 1972; Selltiz, et. al., 1976; and Simon, 1976). Given the fact that the questionnaires were mailed during the summer months when many persons are on vacation and many academicians are involved in their own research endeavors, the response rate received could probably be characterized as exceptional.

It is not possible to specify such important descriptive characteristics of the non-respondents as age, year of graduation from college, year of graduation from graduate/professional school and institutions from which their undergraduate and graduate degrees were obtained. Even though it may be risky business to assume gender from the names of persons, it appears, only from an examination of first and/or middle names, that 34 percent of the non-respondents were women and 66 percent were men. An examination of the lists of names supplied by informant professionals, who identified their selections by the highest degree obtained and the three (3) rosters of conferences, that four of the non-respondents held the Doctor of Optometry degree; four held the Doctor of Social Work degeee; eight were dentists; eighteen (18) were lawyers; fifteen (15) were physicans; six were engineers, and thirteen (13) were holders of either the Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree. The inordinately high proportion of physicians, dentists and lawyers, among the non-respondents, may reflect one of several possible explanations: (1) aversion to the completion of questionnaries, (2) lack of appreciation for survey social science research, (3) a feeling that some of the questions may have required too much time to answer, (4) the length of the questionnaire in relation to the time available to recall important events in their lives, and procrastination. The fact remains that this trilogy of professionals accounted for 58 percent of the seventy-one (71) non-respondents -- a fact that may have contributed significantly to disproportionately in some of the cells observed in data analysis. Their disinclination to respond to social science research, if that is a reasonable conclusion that can be drawn from this experience, suggests that future endeavors might well consider the necessity of over-sampling members of these groups in order to have a sufficient number of cases for the kind of analysis desired.

Finally, non-respondents resided in all parts of the nation. The majority of them resided at the time of the mailing in the South (45 cases or 63 percent) and Far West (18 cases or 25 percent) and the remainder were residents of the North and Northeast (8 cases or 12 percent).

Variables

The variables selected from the analyses presented in this study are based upon observations of apparent relevant factors in networking and mentoring reported in the previous review of pertinent literature.

1. Sex is a dichotomous variable and was used as a measure of both the degree of networking, network ties and as a determinant of participation in the mentoring process.
2. Education referred to the type of degree received. Although eight different degree choices were listed by the participants, due to the disproportionality in the distributions, it was necessary to re-code the "Education" variable through combinations of categories. This re-coding created three categories: (1) holders of the bachelors and Masters degrees were coded "1" and labeled "lower level professionals;" (2) holders of the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees were re-coded "2" and labeled "Graduate degree;" and (3) holders of the Ll.B., M.D., DDS. and O.D. degrees were re-coded "3" and labeled "higher professional degrees."
3. Type of Undergraduate institution permitted the following four response categories: (1) private and historically black, (2) private and historically white, (3) public and historically black, and (4) public and historically white.
4. Type of Graduate and Professional School referred to the characteristics of the institution from which the respondent's graduate or professional degree was obtained. The four response categories were: (1) private and historically black, (2) private and historically white, (3) public and historically black, and (4) public and historically white.

5. Institutional location or REGION is a dichotomous varible. It represents a re-code of the type of undergraduate institution so that a code "1" meant an historically black undergraduate institution and "2" represented northern white undergraudate college or university. All but three cases fell into one of the two categories. All jurisdictions outside the District of Columbia and the eighteen southern and border states were treated as "northern" states.

6. Age: For the sake of convenience, the age variable was computed from the years in which the respondent received the undergraduate degree and the year in which the highest professional degree was received.

   A. The variable, labeled COHORT, was determined by the following age groupings with respect to the year the undergraduate degree was awarded:

      Pre-1950 was coded "1"
      1950-1959 was coded "2"
      1960-1969 was coded "3"
      1970-1983 was coded "4"

   B. The variable "Highest Prof. Degree" also served as a proxy for age and was determined by the following groupings:

      Pre-1950 was re-coded "1"
      1950-1959 was coded "2"
      1960-1969 was coded "3"
      1970-1980 was coded "4"
      1981-1983 was coded "5".

7. Occupation: This variable represents a modified Blau-Duncan Index of Occupations. The Blau-Duncan (1967:22-23) Index adhered closely to categories provided earlier on by Reiss in his delineation and re-grouping of occupational categories listed by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (Reiss, 1961). The rank order of occupational categories presented in this study followed closely to the Blau-Duncan model. However, because of the relatively small numbers in some categories and in order to increase manageability in cross-tabulations, several of the occupations listed by the respondents were combined. This process and the subsequent reclassification were augmented by an analysis of the job descriptions provided by respondents. As a result, five occupational categories were identified among respondents: (1) The code of "1" was assigned to physicians, dentists, lawyers, judges, engineers, salaried bankers and managers, and self-employed proprietors; (2) the code of "2" was assigned to college presidents, high level academic administrators, deans, college professors with the rank of Assistant Professor or above; (3) other university administrators, such as affirmative action officers, assistants, directors of special admissions, were coded "3"; (4) Students were coded "4;" and (5) a code of "5" was assigned to the category "other," which included consultants, and non-university teachers.

8. Mentor was not pre-defined for the respondents. This variable was computed as a composite index based upon items cited earlier on as characteristics and or functions of mentors. It assumed that all persons who may be identified by respondents as "the most important person" during their graduate or professional school experience may

not have functioned equally in the execution of presumed or perceived mentoring behavior. It also assumed that, therefore, there are different degrees or levels of mentoring, as cited by such researchers as Shapiro, Haseltine and Rowe (1978). Based upon relevant literature, twenty-three (23) items were selected as critical to the role of mentoring in graduate or professional school (See item 49 in questionnaire, Appendix A). Of these items, ten were double-weighted because they were regarded as more important for the mentoring process than others. These items were: (1) was an advocate for me, (2) involved me in his/her research project(s), (3) sharpened my intellectual skills, (4) guided me through the university bureaucracy, (5) helped me obtain graduate assistantship,(6) permitted me to collaborate on research with him/her, (7) permitted me to collaborate on publications with him/her, (8) helped me make professional contacts before graduation, (9) helped socialize me into the requirements of my profession, and (10) helped me obtain my very first job after leaving school.

The maximum score from weighted items (6 x 10) was 60 plus 39 points from the non-weighted (3 x 13) items produced an overall possible score of 99. An examination of the frequency distributions permitted a trichotimized scale that depicted levels of mentoring. For this analysis, the following labels were given to the levels of mentoring:

Persons who scored between 75 to 99 were called mentors and coded "1;" persons who scored from 66 to 74 were called "sponsors" and coded "2:" while persons who scored from 0 to 55 were labeled "advisors, teachers or peers" and coded "3." The mentor variable is also called "Scale."

9. Post-Graduate/Professional Functions (PGPF) variable referred to the kinds of functions provided by the various levels of mentors for the protegé/student after graduation. It is a continuous variable and was computed on a summed scale constructed from twenty (20) sub-components of item number 55 in the questionnaire (See Questionnaire, Appendix A). The maximum score possible on this scale was 100.

10. Network variable was labeled "NET - 2." This scale is also a composite index computed from the nineteen responses in question number 29 of the questionnaire (See Appendix A). Each item in NET - 2 is cited in the literature as an important element in networking. Response categories measured degrees of importance of each item in the scale. Scores on each item ranged from "1" for "of no importance," to "2" for "of some importance," and "3" for "of great importance." Therefore, the maximum score on the total scale was 57. Responses produced a trichotimized scale with scores as follows:

    Strong Network = a score of 38 to 55; coded "1"
    Adequate Network = a score of 31 to 37, coded "2"
    Weak Network = a score of 21 to 30, coded "3."

11. A variable called "Ties" was computed from the scores on four items: (1) "amount of time spent with most intimate friends" (respondents were provided with three possible categories that ranged from a few hours each day to less frequently than twice per month), (2) "a source of companionship" (with one of three

options that ranged from "of no importance" to "of great importance," (3) "provided emotional support" (with three options possible, ranging from "of no importance," to "of great importance," and (4) "good for mutual confiding" (with the same options as indicated in 2 and 3 above). The possible score on each item ranged from "1" for little time or, "of no importance" to "3" for great amount of time, or "of great importance." The maximum score on this index was twelve (12). The "Ties Scale" produced was trichotomized as follows:

Strong ties = a score of 9 - 12; coded "1"
Adequate ties = a score of 6 - 8; coded "2"
Weak ties = a score of 1 - 5; coded "3."

The items included in the "Ties" scale are consistent with observations made by Granovetter (1978:1360) who asserted that the strength of a network tie is manifested in the "amount of time" individuals in the friendship network spend with each other, the "emotional intensity," of the relationship, intimacy of the relationship (mutual confiding), and "reciprocal services" provided by participants in interpersonal relationships.

12. Acquaintance Volume refers to the average number of people known per semester while enrolled in graduate or professional school. The median number of students known was 30.3; the mean was 45.8 and the mode was 99. Granovetter (1978) argues that the acquaintance volume is important for understanding a person's sense of community and that this variable is measured by the number of social contacts the individual makes within a certain time frame.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, et. al., 1975) was used in data analysis. Reliance was made of descriptive statistics, the Chi Square test of significance and the Pearson Correlation Coefficient in the analysis of the data and for decisions concerning the support or lack of support for stated hypotheses. The tests of significance are subject to the limitations of the study identified in the last section of this chapter.

Characteristics of the Respondents

In this section, respondents will be characterized in terms of standard demographic features: sex, age, marital status, educational, type of undergraduate institution, type of graduate/professional school, and present occupation.

Sex: More than seven-tenths of all respondents (72.4%) were male and slightly less than three-tenths (27.6%) were female. This imbalanced sex ratio may be explained by imbalances in the proportion of black men and women recipients of graduate and professional degrees which still favors men, as is the case in the general population; by who is probably more likely to receive funds to attend the types of meetings from which the rosters for sample selection were obtained, and by who is more likely to hold appointments in predominantly white colleges and universities.

Age: The respondents ranged in age from 24 to 85. The median age of respondents was 42.1 years and the mean was 38.4 years of age. As shown in Table 1, most respondents stated they were born in the time period of 1941 to 1950. The large number of persons in the 1951 to 1960 cohort is a reflection of the deliberate effort to select persons from the class of 1983 in two law schools. The fact that the median age of the respondents was about forty years suggests that most respondents had already established themselves in a career. Some respondents may have been at the stage of a possible mid-career change. Younger persons had yet to achieve their maximum career potential.

Table 1. Age of Respondents

Year of Birth (categories)	N	Percent
Pre 1910-1920	8	5.1
1921-1930	30	18.9
1931-1940	32	20.5
1941-1950	71	45.5
1951-1960	15	9.6
Total	156	99.6*

*less than 100 due to rounding off

Marital Status: The majority of the respondents were married at the time the survey was conducted (59.9%). Slightly more than a fifth (22.3%) were single; about one-eight (12.1%) were divorced; and the remainder were either separated (3.3%) or widowed (1.3%). Only one case was missing in this analysis (See Table 2).

Table 2. Marital Status of Respondents

Marital Status	N	Percent	Adjusted Frequency (Pct.)
Married	94	59.9	60.3
Single	35	22.3	22.4
Divorced	19	12.1	12.2
Separated	6	3.8	3.9
Widowed	2	1.3	1.3
Missing cases	1	.6	---
Total	157	100.0	100.0

Table 3. State of Birth of Respondents

State	N	Absolute Frequency (Pct.)	Adjusted Frequency (Pct.)
Alabama	9	5.7	5.8
Arkansas	1	.6	.6
California	4	2.4	2.6
Colorado	2	1.3	1.3
Connecticut	1	.6	.6
Delaware	1	.6	.6
District of Colum.	7	4.5	4.5
Florida	1	.6	.6
Georgia	4	2.5	2.6
Illinois	9	5.7	5.8
Indiana	3	1.9	1.9
Iowa	1	.6	.6
Kansas	1	.6	.6
Kentucky	1	.6	.6
Louisiana	22	14.0	14.1
Maine	2	1.3	1.3
Maryland	4	2.5	2.6
Massachusetts	3	1.9	1.9
Michigan	4	2.5	2.6
Minnesota	1	.6	.6
Mississippi	6	3.8	3.8
Missouri	6	3.8	3.8
New Jersey	3	1.9	1.9
New York	12	7.6	7.7
No. Carolina	9	5.7	5.8
Ohio	9	5.7	5.8
Oklahoma	2	1.3	1.3
Pennsylvania	5	3.2	3.2
So. Carolina	3	1.9	1.9
Tennessee	4	2.5	2.6
Texas	5	3.2	3.2
Utah	1	.6	.6
Virginia	8	5.1	5.1
Other	2	1.3	1.3
-99	1	.6	Missing
Total	157	100.0	100.0

State of Birth: Of the 156 persons who responded to this item, thirty-three states and two foreign countries (Panama and Haiti) were listed as states of birth. Ninety-three (59%) stated that they were born in one of the eighteen southern and border states. The state of Louisiana accounted for 22 persons in this category. Among other states in this region, Alabama and North Carolina were represented by as many as nine respondents; eight were born in Virginia, and seven were born in the District of Columbia. Outside the southern and border states, the states of New York (12), Ohio (9), and Illinois (9) were most frequently cited as the state of birth (Table 3).

Type of Undergraduate College: The respondents were almost perfectly distributed in terms of the type of undergraduate college from which the baccalaureate degree was received. Specifically, 27.5 percent received their undergraduate degrees from private and historically black colleges while 26.8 percent were graduated from private and historically white colleges (Table 4). They were evenly divided among those who were graduated from public institutions (22.8%).

Table 4. Type of Undergraduate College

Type of Institution	N	Percent
Private, historically black	42	27.5
Private, historically white	41	26.8
Public, historically black	35	22.9
Public, historically white	35	22.9
Total	153	100.0

Type of Graduate/Professional School: Not unexpectedly, a significantly large proportion of the respondents received their graduate or professional degree from a predominantly white institution (Table 5). Almost eighty percent of them were graduated either from a private, historically white institution (37.3%) or from a public, historically white (41.8%) graduate or professional school. Only fourteen (9.2%) of the respondents received this degree from a private and historically black institution and eighteen (11.3%) were graduated from public, historically black graduate or professional schools. Graduates from black graduate and professional schools were primarily recipients of degrees in either medicine, dentistry or law. One explanation for the inordinately large proportion of recipients of doctoral degrees from predominantly white institutions, aside from the diversity of curricula at white institutions, is the paucity of doctoral degree programs offered at the historically black institutions. Only about six historically black colleges and universities offer doctoral programs. In general, these institutions have neither the staff nor the resources requisite for comprehensive doctoral programs. Consequently, the options for doctoral degrees are restricted for black graduate students. The profile of professional degree recipients may have been altered somewhat had more dentists, lawyers and physicians actually participated in the study.

Table 5. Characteristics of Institutions From Which Highest Degree was Received by Number and Percent

Type of Institution	N (153)	Percent
Private, historically black	14	9.2
Private, historically white	57	37.3
Public, historically black	18	11.8
Public, historically white	64	41.8
Total	153	100.0

Highest Degree Received: As shown in Table 6, about one-half of the respondents (50.6%) reported having earned either a Ph.D. (40.9%) or an Ed.D. (9.7%) degree. Twelve point three (12.3%) of the respondents reported that their highest degree was the B.A. and the same percent indicated that it was a Masters' degree. They were included in the analysis because of their present occupations and/or because they reported that they were still seeking another graduate or professional degree.* Physicians (M.D. degree) accounted for eleven percent (11%) of the cases; lawyers (L.L.B degree) accounted for another 8.4%, and dentists (D.D.S. degree) contributed 4.5% of the cases. Only one of the respondents had earned the Doctor of Optometry degree.

Major in Graduate/Professional School: Studies by Blackwell (1981) and Thomas (1981) have shown that most blacks who receive a graduate or professional degree major in the field of Education. This finding is further illustrated in the distribution of major fields of study reported by respondents in this study. Education majors account for slightly more than one-fourth (25.5%) of the fields reported. Education is followed by the Social Sciences and Psychology (19.1%). This pattern is consistent with the distribution of doctoral degrees among blacks in the general population (Blackwell, 1981:Chapter 10). Similarly, the compartively low percentages of persons with majors in such fields as Physical sciences, Life sciences, Dentistry and Optometry are consistent with previous research findings (Blackwell, 1981). The major variations here, with respect to the distribution of black professionals in the black population, are the larger than expected proportion of persons who majored in the fields of medicine (11.5%) and law (17.8%). These proportions are about three and

---

*An earned graduate or professional degree was not made explicit requirement for participation in the study. Therefore, those persons who were incumbents of professional positions and/or who were still in pursuit of an advanced degree were permitted inclusion in the sample. Others who could not meet these requirements were eliminated.

Table 6. Respondents by Highest Degree Received, Number and Percent

Highest Degree	N (154)	Percent
BA/BS	19	12.3
Masters	19	12.3
Ed.D.	15	9.7
Ph.D.	63	40.9
O.D.	1	.6
Ll.B.	13	8.4
D.D.S.	7	4.5
M.D.	17	11.0
Total	154	100.0

Table 7. Number of Respondents by Major in Professional School and Percent

Major Field of Study	N (157)	Percent
Physical Sciences	9	5.7
Life Sciences	5	3.2
Social Sciences and Psychology	30	19.1
Education	40	25.5
Humanities/Arts	5	3.2
Medicine	18	11.5
Dentistry	7	4.5
Law	28	17.8
Optometry	1	.6
Theology	1	.6
Teaching Fields	11	7.0
Total	157	100.0

four times, respectively, greater than generally expected (Table 7).

Limitations of Study

In discussing the limitations of this study, the reader is reminded that this is an exploratory study. An implicit goal of any exploratory research is to ascertain whether or not the problem under investigation is worthy of a more broad-gauged study. In these instances, as in most survey research, probability sampling is certainly preferable over non-probability sampling. This preference refers specifically to what is legitimate, in a strict sense, with respect to tests of significance and the problem of estimation (Forcese and Richer, 1970; and Blalock, 1972). With respect to tests of significance, for instance, a central issue is the degree to which generalizability is permissable when there are special problems in sample selection, or whether or not principles of randomization were followed. Any test of significance presumes the existence of a random sample. However, tests of significance are appropriate notonly for generalizability to a sample/population but it can also be interpreted to allow the researcher to assess the extent to which random factors may be able to produce relationships in the cases irrespective of the type of sample utilized in the study.

There is considerable body of literature to support the contention that non-probability sampling techniques may be even more necessary and appropriate than probability techniques when, for instance, "the goal is to obtain good ideas, insights, and experienced critical appraisal" (Selltiz, et. al., 1976: 535; Blalock, 1972:528). In this study, as previously stated, a snowball sample was selected; however, randomization principles were followed in the selection of the potential respondents.

Tests of significance were utilized in data analysis, especially the Chi Square. The Chi-square results are presented primarily for those readers who feel that a test of significance may be of value, even in cases in which non-probability sampling strategies were used, to facilitate understanding and explanations of possible relationships between two or more more variables. It is in this context that both descriptive statistics, the Pearson's r, and Chi Square will be important in analyzing the findings with respect to the hypotheses posed earlier on. This combination of techniques permits an understanding of analytical, structural, and contextual properties of responses made by individuals, and of collectivities of respondents in this study.

Another limitation of the study is what may appear to be an over-representation of persons holding the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees in relation to the apparent smaller proportion of persons holding such degrees as the M.D., D.D.S. and Ll.B. However, the fact of the matter is that among black graduates of graduate and professional schools, only about five percent are recipients of "professional degrees" while the combined total of other degrees (including the Ed.D. which accounts for sixty percent of all doctorates awarded to blacks) approaches 90 percent (Blackwell, 1981). Hence, despite the seemmingly disproportionate number of Ed.D.s and Ph.D.s in this sample, they do not actually constitute over-representation when their proportion in this research is considered in relationship to their distribution among blacks in the graduate/professional population as a whole.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS: NETWORKING

The primary focus of this chapter is on various dimensions of networking experienced by blacks while in graduate and professional school. This analysis is based upon quantitative and qualitative data; special use is made of anecdotal materials provided by respondents. Observations drawn from descriptive statistics and chi square analyses are presented in the interpretation of findings.

Social Networks

In Chapter I, networks were defined as a process of information sharing and exchange which facilitate the construction of important contacts for the attainment of present and future goals. They involve relationships characterized by a high degree of reciprocity, mutual trust, feedback, personal accountability, as well as varying degrees of intimacy and self-confidence. It is evident from the literature cited in Chapter II, that tremendous effort is often required for the construction of viable networks. Some persons are able to get a head start, so to speak. For instance, it may be argued that facilitating conditions include arrriving at an institution with an existing social network of friends and acquaintances, or being an extroverted personality capable of establishing friendship contacts quickly, or possessing special talents that immediately cause others to seek out this individual, or simply being fearless and self-assertive. On the other hand, the absence of such presumed pre-conditions for network involvement may necessitate a special and sometimes protracted effort to be included in a viable network.

These assumptions raise a number of important questions that may be addressed through empirical research: (1) How do networks begin? (2) In what kinds of situations or social contexts do people meet their closest friends? (3) Of what importance are existing campus, social groups for creating a positive social life for graduate and/or professional students? (4) What is the magnitude of the acquaintance volume, or the number of people actually known, or of the intimacy formed with associates during a specific time frame as while in graduate or professional schools? (5) What is the nature of the networks established; for instance, are they strong? Adequate?, or Weak? Are they enduring; in other words, are they bound by time and place or do they continue well after participants in networks have left their institutional settings? (6) What is the nature of ties or social bonds established during graduate or professional school? and (7) What factors or variables are correlated with the various dimensions of networking? While all of these questions will not be equally addressed in this chapter, each has a pertinence of its own and all are highly salient in shedding light on the nature, magnitude and quality of social networks blacks are able to establish, or in which they are able to participate during various stages of their training and professional life.

Context in which closest friends met: People who are regarded as one's closest friends are met in a great variety of social contexts. Each context may be of special value in determining (an individual's) future social networks. In the contemporary marketplace, a great deal is made of "old boy networks" which are presumably formed largely in college, graduate or professional school. Participants in such networks, however, may or may not be "close" friends. They may be significant functionaries in the network system who help to maintain critical linkages in the system. Nonetheless, the circumstances under which close friendship ties were developed are important to understand. In the case of respondents in this study, they stated that persons whom they regarded as their closest friends at the present time were met in rank order in: (1) in college (21.5%), (2) through their present work (20.8%), (3) during childhood or in high school (19.5%), (4) in graduate or professional school (18.1%), and (5) other, (community organizations, church or civic organizations) or (16%) (Table 8).

Table 8. Context in Which Closest Friends Were Met by Type, Number and Percent

Context or Type of Setting	N	Percent
Childhood or high school	29	19.5
Met in College	32	21.5
Met in Grad/Professional School	27	18.1
Met Through Current Work	31	20.8
Met Through my Spouse	1	.7
Met Through another Friend	3	2.0
Met through professional organizations	2	1.3
Other	24	16.1
Total	149	100.0

Although less than one-fifth of the individuals stated that their closest friends were met while they were in graduate or professional school, this does not mean that their acquaintance volume was restricted to "close friends." In fact, extensive variation was observed in the number of people known among the respondents and the degree of intimacy that characterized their relationships, as well as in the continuity of relationships established while in graduate and professional school.

Acquaintance volume (A-V) refers to the average number of students known per semester while in graduate or professional school. The respondents in this study reported a range of students known from 0-300.* The median number known was 30.3 per semester. The students enrolled in medical, dental and law schools tended to report having known "all students" enrolled in their particular class or "all persons" enrolled in the first two years of a program. One underlying assumption here is that they were likely to establish contact with and "know" all persons encountered in the classroom situation.

However, all students were not known equally well. In terms of median per cent known in specified categories, only 4.7% of students known by a respondent were considered "among my most intimate friends;" 20% were considered "among my friendship group but not closest friends;" 35.0% were regarded as "casual acquaintances;" 5.0% were thought of as "friends of friends of mine," and 1.2% were persons known by the respondent but the respondents were not sure that they were known to the person.

When asked to characterize their "closest friends while in graduate or professional school" in racial terms, over half of the respondents stated they were either "exclusively black" (26.3%) or "primarily black" (30.3%). Another fifth stated that they were both "black and white" (21.7%), while only about one-sixth (16.4%) stated their closest friends were either "exclusively" or "primarily white" (See Table 9).

Time Spent With Friends: Among students regarded as "most intimate friends, more than one third (34.3%) reported that they spent a "few hours each day" with them. Slightly less than one half (45.5%) of the respondents stated that they were with their most intimate friends two or three times per week while about one-tenth (10.5%) saw them only once per week. About one in 20 (4.9%) of the respondents reported that they saw their most intimate friends only about

---

*For coding purposes, the number 99 was used as upper limit of the number of persons known.

Table 9. Race of Closest Friends While in Graduate or Professional School

Category	N (N=152)	Percent
Exclusively Black	40	26.3
Exclusively white	11	7.2
Primarily black	46	30.3
Primarily white	14	9.2
Blacks and whites	33	21.7
Blacks and Other	4	2.6
Primarily other	1	.7
All Groups	3	2.0
Total	152	100.00

Table 10. Relationships With Friendship Groups After Graduation

Categories (In Grad./Prof. School) We Were:	Present Relationships					
	No Relationship		Casual Relationship		Strong Relationship	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Closest Friends (N=136)	21	15.4	52	38.2	63	46.3
Friends but not close (N=141)	45	31.9	86	61.0	10	7.1
Casual Acquaintances (N=129)	91	70.5	37	28.7	1	.8
Friends of Friends (N=118)	95	80.5	22	18.6	1	.8
Persons I knew but not sure they knew me (N=101)	94	93.1	7	6.9	0	0

twice per month or less frequently.

With respect to the construction and maintenance of network ties, an important issue concerns what happens to the relationships after graduation. These relationships are depicted in Table 10.

An acquaintance volume (A-V) scale was computed on the basis of the reported number of students known by each respondent during each semester. This trichotomized scale was arranged as follows: 0-20 persons known = 1; from 23 -50 persons known = 2, and from 50 - above = 3. (No respondents stated that he/she knew 21, 22 or 51 persons; hence, these number were excluded from the scale.

As shown in Table 11, 35.9% of the persons scored "1;" 27.5% scored "2" and 36.6% socred "3" on the A-V scale. Differences in acquaintance volume varied significantly by the characteristics of the institution from which respondents received their highest (graduate or professional) degree. Within and between institutional categories, major differences were noted. For instance, among the fourteen persons who graduated from private, historically black institutions, 71.4% scored high ("3") on the acquaintance volume scale. Respondents were evenly divided between medium and low scorers (14.3%) if they were graduated from a private historically black institution. If they went to a public, black college, 55.6% scored "high" while 27.8% scored "medium," and only 16.7% scored low in acquaintance volume. Significantly, a very small number of respondents scored at these levels (Table 11).

By contrast, respondents who attended a private, traditionally white institution were more likely to score "low" or "1" on acquaintenance volume (47.4%) "2" or medium (29.8%) than they were to score high (22.8%). In traditionally white, public graduate/professional schools, the distribution of acquaintance volume was more evenly divided between high and lower scorers (35.9% each) and to be similar to all other institutional types with respect to the proportion found in the medium category (28.1%).

Acquaintance Volume and Education: A significant relationship was observed between the acquaintance volume and distribution on the education scale. The degrees obtained by the respondents were re-grouped so that recipients of the Bachelors and Masters degrees were re-coded "1;" persons who held the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees were re-coded "2," and all other professional degrees (e.g., M.D., D.D.S., L.L.B., O.D.) were re-coded "3." As shown in Table 12, recipients of professional degrees are more likely to have had a higher acquaintance volume than either of the remaining two groups. Participants in this study showed that

Table 11. Acquaintance Volume by Characteristics of Institution From Which Highest Degree Was Received

Rank on A-V Scale[a]	Characteristics of Institutions									
	Private, Black		Private, White		Public, Black		Public, White		Row Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 = Low	2	14.3	27	47.4	3	16.7	23	35.9	55	35.9
2 = Medium	2	14.3	17	29.8	5	27.8	18	28.1	42	27.5
3 = High	10	71.4	13	22.8	10	55.6	23	35.9	56	36.6
Column Total	14	9.2	57	37.3	18	11.8	64	41.8	153	100.0

a = Acquaintance Volume
Chi Square = 16.14, DF = 6; Significance = .0130

of the 38 persons who held professional degrees, 57.8% scored high, 28.9% scored medium, while 13.2% only scored low on the A-V scale. By contrast, holders of the doctorate did not fare as well with respect to the number of people known. Of the 78 doctorates, 24.4% scored high; another 28.8% scored medium while slightly less than half (47.4%) scored low on the A-V scale. In fact, recipients of the doctoral degree scored lower on the A-V scale than did either of the three groups. A further examination of Table 12 shows that of the 38 persons who held lower level graduate or professional degrees (BA/BS/MA/MS), 34.2% scored high, 26.3% scored medium, and 39.5% scored low on the A-V scale. In fact, a slightly larger percentage scored "low" than scored "high" in acquaintance volume.

The differences in A-V scores between these three groups may be explained by the structure of their educational programs, nature of their work, and the intensity of their degree programs. For instance, persons in the higher level professional degree programs (e.g., medical, dental and law students) are likely to be given a more rigidly prescribed curriculum which, in turn, forces persons in pursuit of these degrees to have a larger number of classes together. They are also brought together more frequently, and sometimes within a shorter period of time and they are able to collaborate more often (in laboratories, moot courts, and so forth) than is the case for recipients of doctoral, masters and bachelors degrees who are more likely to work independently.

Table 12. Acquaintance Volume by Education

Rank on A-V Scale	Educational Categories						Row Total	
	Bachelor/ Masters		Ed.D./ Ph.D.		Professional (MD, DDS, LLB, OD)			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 = Low	15	39.5	37	47.4	5	13.2	57	37.0
2 = Medium	10	26.3	22	28.2	11	28.9	43	27.9
3 = High	13	34.2	19	24.4	22	57.9	54	35.1
Column Total	38	24.7	78	50.6	38	24.7	154	100.0

Chi Square = 16.45; DF = 4; Significance = .0025

Acquaintance Volume By Collaboration: Not unexpectedly, rank on the Acquaintance Volume (A-V) Scale was significantly related to collaboration with friends on professional activities. People are more likely to work with persons known to them than with strangers. The important fact here, however, is whether or not the persons with whom one collaborates are among their closest friends while they were in graduate or professional school. At least for participants in this study, the answer to this question is positive (Table 13).

Almost three-fifths of the respondents (59.7%) stated they had collaborated with friends from graduate or professional school on various professional activities. Of the 86 persons in this category, 43.0% ranked high on the A-V scale. By contrast, of the 58 persons who stated they had never collaborated with friends from graduate or professional school, the ranking distribution was reversed. Specifically, almost half (48.3%) ranked low on the A-V scale while the remainder were equally distributed between medium (25.9%) and high (25.9%) scorers on this scale (Table 13).

Table 13. Acquaintance Volume by Collaboration With Friends From Graduate or Professional School

Rank on A-V Scale	Have you collaborated with Grad/Prof. Sch. Friends on Activities					
	Yes		No		Row Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1 = Low	24	27.8	28	48.3	52	36.1
2 = Medium	25	29.1	15	25.9	40	27.8
3 = High	37	43.0	15	25.9	52	36.1
Column Total	86	59.7	58	40.3	144	100.0

Chi Square = 6.93; DF = 2; Significance = .0312

As illustrated in Table 10, the character and quality of relationships formed in graduate or professional school may shift or change over time. Consequently, the strength of the social ties and friendship networks established in that stage of a person's life may be transformed in highly significant ways. Even among those persons regarded as closest friends, the majority of the respondents stated that these persons were presently persons with whom they had either only a casual relationship or none at all.

What factors account for such changes in the quality of character of relationships established in an environment such as a graduate or professional school? Statements provided by respondents suggests that the answer to this question may be considered within the framework of four themes.

First there are those persons who have drifted apart because of differences in rate of "growth" or due to the geographical distance between them after graduation. The following statements illustrate this theme:

> "Due to our individual professional growth and relocating all over the country, it is somewhat hard to carry on an intimate relationship. Although we were close in graduate school, I am sure we still hold fond memories of our friendship."

Another commented that "geographical distance substantially decreased contact with school mates over time." One respondent stated that:

> "Over the years, other friendships were developed in the workplace, and the extent that your friends from graduate school now live in other geographical areas, only casual relationships remain."

The same theme was also expressed by another respondent who commented that:

> "I now live in California and most of my close graduate school friends are still in the East. It is difficult to maintain close relationships. My casual relationships have become close because the individuals moved to California, and we see each other frequently in professional and social settings."

Still another stated that: "Most of the people I knew live in areas of the country where we have very little contact. If we did live in proximity, I believe we would still be casual friends."

A second theme focused on the social context in which the persons' graduate or professional school training was experienced. For instance, one respondent stated that "While in graduate school, I held an internship on another campus. I only visited the degree awarding campus area a week (on the average); so the number of people I knew was small." A similar situation was revealed in the comment of the respondent who stated that: "Most of my graduate work was done as a part-time student while holding down a full-time job. Thus, there were social support systems on the job."

A third theme observed as an explanation for why the relationships between members of a graduate or professional school friendship network change after graduation involves a "diversity of factors." This theme is evident in the following comment from a respondent:

> "These relationships have been affected by moving away from the location of the graduate school, by developing different interests and relationships, by the death of some school friends and the passage of years."

Finally, there are those persons who remain friends after graduation. In this regard, one respondent commented:

> "I remain friendly at least to all my graduate school colleagues. Thus, I am conviced that our mutual respect and concern for one another remain intact. All that has really changed is the excessive devotion which we have committed to personal careers, families, etc. However, we do keep track of one another and several of us continue our contact by writing to one another, occasionally."

Others retain strong relationships because of their participation in professional associations, and through joint activities such as memberships on committees of professional and community organizations, collaboration on research projects, and involvement in trans-national social and political networks.

Social Life in Graduate/Professional School: Some authors have reported that many black students hold negative feelings about the quality of their social life while in school (Blackwell, 1981; Edwards, 1970; Willie, 1972). Although many complaints tend to focus on the absence of a critical mass of black students, several students have also expressed disappointment over the paucity of voluntary associations and formal organizations of special interest to them. Voluntary associations, formal and informal organizations range from such institutional structures within the community as the church, civic organizations, social clubs, and civil rights organizations. On campus structures include both campus-based groups as well as local chapters of national organizations.

Table 14. Degree of Importance of Selected Factors in Creating a Positive Social Life While in Graduate or Professional School

Item	Response Categories: Degrees of Importance									
	Did Not Exist		Was not a Member		None		Some		Great	
	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.
Black Student Chapter of Your Professional Organization (e.g., BALSA) (N=152)	82	53.9	13	8.6	22	14.5	25	15.9	10	6.6
Local Chapter of the Largely White Professional Organization in your Field (N=149)	15	10.1	41	27.5	48	32.2	40	26.8	5	3.4
The National Honor Society of your profession (N-150)	21	14.0	50	33.3	40	26.7	34	22.7	5	3.3
A Traditionally Black Greek Letter Society (Fraternity/Sorority) (N=152)	14	9.2	48	31.6	40	22.4	34	22.4	16	10.5
Other Social Groups on Campus* (N=129)	3	2.3	38	29.5	31	24.0	34	26.4	23	17.8
Other Social Groups in the Neighboring Community** (N-117)	7	6.0	37	31.6	23	19.7	27	23.1	23	19.7

*Other campus groups included such groups/organizations as (1) Graduate Student Organizations/Government, (2) Forum on Black Affairs, (3) Black Graduate Student Association, (4) International Relations Club, (5) Black Faculty and Staff/Library Association, (6) Black Student Union, (7) Human Relations Council and informal clubs.

**Community Organizations included (1) Churches, (2) Urban Extension Centers, (3) Neighborhood Self-Help Organizations, (4) the NAACP, (5) The Urban League, (6) Political Action Groups, (7) Other Civil Rights Organizations, (8) Settlement Houses, (9) Community Chapter of Black Greek Letter Organization, (10) Elks, (11) Alumni Clubs, and others.

Over half of the respondents in this study (53.7%) stated that a black student chapter of the professional organization associated with their field of study (e.g., Black American Law Students Association) did not exist at the institution where they studied. Less than a tenth of them reported that they were not a member of such organizations (Table 14). About one in seven respondents (14.5%) stated that these organizations were of no importance to them in facilitating a meaningful social life, while slightly more than one-fifth (22.5%) ascribed some (15.9%) to great (6.6%) importance to these groups. Probably because a local chapter of the largely white professional organization associated with one's field of study was more prevalent at the institutions where black students were matriculated, they were apparently more important for the development of their social life than were the black chapters of professional organizations. One notable exception to this generalization lies in the fact that these respondents were almost twice as likely to characterize black student professional organizations as "of great importance" as they were to so describe their white counterpart organization (Table 14).

As depicted in Table 14, it seems evident that black students in graduate and professional schools are more likely to assign greatest importance to black Greek Letter Societies, other social campus-based groups, black groups in the neighboring community for the development of a good social life. This situation may reflect not only a paucity of black students but a problem of either unwillingness to participate in other predominantly white organizations, exclusion from them, or mal-integration into existing social and institutional structures. Changes in the value of these factors for black students may suggest problems of satisfaction in the construction of network ties, or the need for more assertiveness among some black students in different age cohorts or generations to become active participants in a wide array of campus-based organizations.

The Network Scale (NET-2): It was assumed that friendship groups performed a variety of functions for individual graduate and/or professional students during the period of their formal training. It was also assumed that these functions varied in relation to a number of independent variables (to be described below). Further, the functions performed were not equally important as functions per se. The items included in the Network Scale, hereafter referred to as NET-2, and the degree of importance attached by the respondents to each, are presented in Table 15.

Of the nineteen network functions identified in Table 15, the respondents indicated that their friends were least effective in: (1) helping them obtain their first job as a professional, (2) introducing them to influential administrators, (3) introducing them to influential professors, (4) helping them select an advisor or mentor, (5) helping them select courses, (6) in reducing obstructions for goal attainment and (7) in giving advice on what professors to take or not to take. Friends were most effective to the respondents in the following areas: (1) facilitating intellectual discourse, (2) in information exchange, (3) as a source of companionship, (4) providing emotional support, and (5) for mutual confiding.

As indicated earlier on, scoring the nineteen functions produced a trichotomized network scale: (1) strong, (2) adequate, and (3) weak. Participants were almost equally distributed among each category of networking. For instance, 34% of all respondents scored in the strong network category; any equal percentage scored in the "adequate" category, and 32.1% scored at the weak level of networking.

Table 15. Functions Performed by Graduate/Professional School Friends by Number and Percent in Degrees of Importance

Function	Degrees of Importance					
	Little		Some		Great	
	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.
A source of companionship (N=155)	11	7.1	71	45.8	73	47.1
Helped in information exchange (N=157)	5	3.2	65	41.9	85	54.8
Provided emotional support (N=157)	32	20.4	64	40.8	61	38.9
Facilitated intellectual discourse (N=157)	4	2.5	60	38.2	93	59.2
Good mutual confiding (N=155)	36	23.2	68	43.9	51	32.9
Helped/guided me through the system/over hurdles (N=156)	40	25.6	83	53.2	33	21.2
Helped me in academic support (N=155)	38	24.5	79	51.0	38	24.5
Helped me in study sessions (N=156)	50	32.1	61	39.1	45	28.8
Helped me learn how to maneuver educ. bureaucracy (N=156)	70	44.9	65	41.7	21	13.5
Reduced obstructions for my Goal Attainment (N=155)	83	53.5	54	34.8	18	11.6
Helped me select Courses (N=155)	93	60.0	49	31.6	13	8.4
Gave advice on what professors to take/avoid (N=155)	83	53.5	53	34.2	19	12.3
Helped me develop coping strategies for academic life (N=156)	76	48.7	62	39.7	18	11.5
Helped me select advisor/mentor (N=154)	103	66.9	34	22.1	17	11.0
Introduced me to other friends (N=157)	38	24.2	81	51.6	38	24.2
Introduced me to influential faculty (N=156)	100	64.1	45	28.8	11	7.1
Introduced me to Influential Administrators (N=156)	105	67.3	36	23.1	15	9.6
Strengthened my self-confidence (N=156)	56	35.9	72	46.2	28	17.9
Helped me obtain my first job as a professional (N=152)	112	73.7	24	15.8	16	10.5

NET-2 by Sex: Significant gender differences were observed with respect to distribution on the networking scale. As shown in Table 16, 51.2% of the women but only 27.4% of the men scored in the "strong network" level. By contrast, men were more likely to score in both the "adequate" and in the "weak" network levels than were women.

Table 16. Networking By Sex

Category of Network	Female		Male		Row Total	
	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.
1. Strong Network	22	51.2	31	27.4	53	34.0
2. Adequate Network	12	27.9	41	56.3	53	34.0
3. Weak Network	9	20.9	41	36.3	50	32.1
Column Total	43		113		156	100.1*

Chi Square = 8.096; DF = 2 Significance = .0175
*Exceeds 100 due to rounding off.

The findings noted in Table 16 suggest that future studies in this area might focus, inter alia, on explanations for gender differences in the strength of networks established while in graduate or professional school.

Networks and Age: Although age differentiations among blacks with respect to the types of networks constructed while in graduate or professional school were not an explicit purpose of this study, the analysis of data permitted an assessment of the relationship between these two variables (Table 17). It appears that younger or more recent black graduates have stronger networks than older black graduates. The table also shows that graduates from earlier generations are more likely to be clustered in the "weak network" category than are the more recent black graduates of graduate/professional school. One explanation for variations in the types of networks established over generations may lie in the numerical distribution of each group. Almost two-thirds of the respondents were younger persons. They may have become more conscious of the need for strong networks. This consciousness may, in turn, have been a product of a kind of national consciousness-raising concerning networking in various parts of the United States and emphasized in the late 1960s and 1970s.

Table 17. Network Types by Age Cohorts, Number and Percent
(Age Cohort Based Upon Period Undergraduate Degree Received)

Network Category	Pre-1950		1950-1959		1960-1969		1970-Present		Row Total	
	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.
Strong	7	24.1	6	20.7	21	38.2	19	43.2	53	33.8
Adequate	9	31.0	15	51.7	13	23.6	17	38.6	54	34.4
Weak	13	44.8	8	27.6	21	38.2	8	18.2	50	31.8
Column Total	29		29		55		44		157	100.0

Chi Square = 13.41, DF = 6; Significance = .0368

Networking In Undergraduate Colleges: Inasmuch as a significant proportion of participants in this study indicated that they formed their closest friends while in undergraduate college, it seemed interesting to ascertain the influence of that variable on the degree of networking. This analysis showed that black graduates of public white institutions (45.7%) and of public historically black institutions (37.1%) are more likely to establish "strong networks" than are black graduates of either private white or private, historically black colleges and universities. An almost equal percentage of black graduates of public, historically black (42.9%) and black graduates of private white institutions (41.5%) scored at the "adequate" level of networking while black graduates of white public institutions are still more likely to score at the "adequate" level than are black graduates of private black colleges. It is also interesting to note that almost twice as many black graduates of private white institutions score at the "adequate level" than do black graduates of private, historically black institutions. While an equal percentage of black graduates of public white (20%) and public, historically black (20%) score at the "weak" level of networking, a significantly larger percentage (45.2%) of blacks from private, historically black colleges and universities score "weak" on the NET-2 scale in comparison to the 34.1% of black graduates of private, white colleges who are "weak" in networking (Table 18).

This finding is contrary to what might be expected because conventional thinking forces many people to assume that black institutions provide a much stronger support system for black students than do white institutions. Conventional wisdom also promotes the long-held belief that black institutions create a considerably more positive psycho-social environment which, in turn, facilitates enduring networks among black graduates. That network is sometimes embodied in the "small-world" syndrome of blacks which argues that, in this instance, black college graduates are quite likely to know each other because there are so few of them. This belief system might be more applicable for black graduates of white undergraduate institutions at an earlier time, or for that matter, the present time in instances in which there is no critical mass of blacks (Table 18). It seems apparent, at least in this instance, that stronger networks are established by black graduates from white institutions than is the case among those who received their undergraduate degrees from black colleges. The Chi square is presented to demonstrate the degree to which the relationship approach a pre-determined statistical level of acceptable significance.

Table 18. Networking by Type of Undergraduate Institution, Number and Percent

Network Category	Priv. & Hist. Black		Priv. & Hist. White		Public & Hist. Blk		Public & Hist. Whte.		Row Total	
	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.
Strong	14	33.3	10	24.4	13	37.1	16	45.7	53	34.6
Adequate	9	21.4	17	41.5	15	42.9	12	34.3	53	34.6
Weak	19	45.2	14	34.1	7	20.0	7	20.0	47	30.7
Column Total	42		41		35		35		150	100.00

Chi Square = 11.57; DF = 6; Significance = .0722

With respect to networking as related to the type of graduate or professional school attended, again blacks who attended public institutions, whether black or white, score higher on the NET-2 scale than black graduates of private black or white institutions. In fact, as shown in Table 19, almost one-half (46.9%) of black graduates of white public institutions scored "strong" on NET-2. Further, black graduates of historically black public institutions scored "strong" on this scale. By contrast, black graduates of private and historically black institutions were somewhat more likely to score "strong" (28.6%) compared to their counterparts from private, traditonally white institutions in which case only 21.1% scored "strong" on NET-2. Noteworthy is the fact that black graduates of private institutions, whether black or white, were heavily concentrated in the "weak" category on NET-2. Significantly, almost one-half (47.4%) of black graduates from white, private graduate/professional schools in comparison to the 42.9% of blacks from private, historically black graduate or professional institutions scored "weak" on NET-2. The groups were almost equally distributed, with one notable exception indicated in Table 19, with respect to scoring as "adequate" in networking during that phase of their formal education.

While this disparity in networking along the dimension of institutional type may reflect disproportionate numbers, it also raises questions about the quality of life experienced by blacks at different types of graduate or professional institutions. It is conceivable that not only is a critical mass established because of the presence of larger numbers (which may be associated with the differential costs of attending private and public institutions), it may also suggest that a different type of institutional climate prevails at these institutions. It is, therefore, possible, to speculate that the institutional climate at public institutions is more conducive to the establishment and maintenance of viable networks among black students than is the case at private graduate or professional schools.

Table 19. Networking Related to Type of Graduate/Professional Institution, by Number and Percent

Networking Category	Private and Hist. Blk		Private & Hist. Whte		Public and Hist. Blk		Public and Hist. Whte		Row Total	
	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.
Strong	4	28.6	12	21.1	7	38.9	30	46.9	53	34.6
Adequate	4	28.6	18	31.6	7	38.9	23	35.9	52	34.0
Weak	6	42.9	27	47.4	4	22.2	11	17.2	48	31.4
Column Total	14		57		18		64		153	100.0

Chi Square = 16.28; DF = 6; Significance = .0123

Networking and Relations with Friends: It may be assumed from ideas reflected in such concepts as "old boy networks" and, perhaps, "the small world" syndrome that persons who still have strong associations with their closest friends while in graduate or professional school would also score strong on the NET-2 scale. That assumption is borne out by findings in this study (Table 20).

Among persons who scored "strong" on the networking scale, 54% of them reported that their present relationship with graduate/professional closest friends remain strong. "Adequate" scorers were about evenly distributed along the three dimensions measured. However, persons who scored "weak" on NET-2 were substantially more likely to report "no relationship" at all (57.1%) among persons who were among their closest friends while in graduate/professional school.

With respect to students who were regarded as "close but not intimate," the pattern of networking is somewhat more complex. For instance, while the distribution of the present relationship was skewed or tilted from a present relationship characterized as either "casual" (39.5%) to "no relationship" (33.3%), among those who scored "strong" on NET-2, the relationships were tilted from "casual" to "strong" among those who scored either "adequate" or "weak" on NET-2 (Table 21).

Networking Through Collaboration: One of the more common manifestations of networking in the professional world is through collaboration on projects of importance to participants. When the respondents in this study were queried as to whether or not they had collaborated with any of their friends from graduate and professional school, about three fifths (59.7%) responded in the affirmative while four of every ten said they had not collaborated with friends on professional activities. As shown in Table 22, persons who score strong on NET-2 are more likely to have collaborated with friends on professional projects or in professional activities than not. There is only a slight distinction among those who scored "Adequate" on NET-2 with respect to collaborative endeavors with friends. However, among those who score "weak" on NET-2, a significantly greater proportion of them never collaborated than is the case among those who have done so (Table 22). Collaboration involved research and publication activities, presentation of scholarly papers, partnerships in professional and business

Table 20. Networking By Relations With Closest Graduate and Professional School Friends, Number and Percent

Network Category	Present Relationship						Row Total	
	No Relationship		Casual		Strong			
	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.
Strong	1	.7	14	26.9	34	54.0	49	36.0
Adequate	8	38.1	17	32.7	20	31.7	45	33.1
Weak	12	57.1	21	40.4	9	14.3	42	30.9
Column Total	21		52		63		156	100.0

Chi Square = 24.54; DF = 4; Significance = .0001

Table 21. Networking By Relations With Persons Characterized As Close But Not Intimate Friends in Graduate/Professional School, Number and Percent

Network Category	Present Relationship							
	No Relationship		Casual		Strong		Row Total	
	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.
Strong	15	33.3	34	39.5	1	10.0	50	35.5
Adequate	12	26.7	35	40.7	3	30.0	50	35.5
Weak	18	40.0	17	19.8	6	60.0	41	29.1
Column Total	45		86		10		141	100.0

Chi Square = 11.71; DF = 4; Significance = .0196

ventures, mutual recommendations for consultantships, and similar professional endeavors.

Table 22. Networking By Collaboration With Graduate and Professional School Friends in Professional Activities, Number and Percent

Networking Category	Have Collaborated		Have Not Collaborated		Row Total	
	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.
Strong	37	25.7	11	7.6	48	33.3
Adequate	28	32.6	22	37.9	50	34.7
Weak	21	24.4	25	43.1	46	31.9
Column Total	86 (59.7%)		58 (40.3%)		144	100.0

Chi Square = 10.08; DF = 2; Significance = .0064

Table 23. Networking and Career Influence by Number, Percent and Race of Friends

Network Category	Race of Friends									
	Blacks		Whites		Other Minority		Mixture		Row Total	
	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.
Strong	2	45.7	3	13.0	23	47.9	3	9.1	50	33.3
Adequate	13	28.3	12	52.2	15	31.3	12	36.4	52	34.7
Weak	12	26.1	8	34.8	10	20.8	18	54.5	48	32.0
Column Total	46 (30.7%)		23 (15.3%)		48 (32.0%)		33 (22.0%)		150	100.00

Chi Square = 24.25; DF = 6; Significance = .0005

Networking and Acquaintance Volume: In this study, a statistically significantly relationship was observed between the NET-2 (Networking) scale and the A-V (Acquaintance Volume) scale. Hence, persons who score strong on networking can expect to also score strong on the A-V scale. As shown in Table 24, 37.5% of those persons who had a high acquaintance volume scored high on NET-2; 46.4% of them scored average while 16.1% scored weak on NET-2. Similarly, 26.3% of those persons who scored weak on the A-V scale scored strong on NET-2 while

29.8% scored average and 43.9% of those persons who scored weak on A-V also scored weak on NET-2. Although approximately the same number of persons score high as weak in acquaintance volume, the analysis reveals that persons who are weak in networking are the same persons who know fewer people, while those who know more people tend to have been more successful in networking during their graduate or professional school years (Table 24).

Table 24. Networking Related to Acquaintance Volume

Rank on NET-2 Scale	Rank on Acquaintance Volume Scale							
	Low		Medium		High		Row Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strong	15	26.3	17	38.6	21	37.5	53	33.8
Average	17	29.8	11	25.0	26	46.4	54	34.4
Weak	25	43.9	16	36.4	9	16.1	50	31.8
Column Total	57	36.3	44	28.0	56	35.7	157	100.0

Chi Square = 12.55; DF = 6; Significance = .0137

When the characteristics of graduate or professional schools attended are dichotomized to black versus white institutions, the relationship between this variable and distribution along the A-V scale is statistically significant. In the first place, it is interesting to note again that only about one-fifth of the participants in this study attended black institutions while approximately four-fifths matriculated and were graduated from white institutions. Acquaintance volume is proportionately higher among those blacks who were graduated from private and historically black institutions than is the case for those who received graduate or professional school degrees from private and/or predominantly white institutions. Among those who attended black institutions, 62.5% scored high in acquaintance volume compared to 29.8% among those who attended predominantly white graduate or professional schools. Another striking difference is in the considerably larger percentage of blacks who attended white institutions, with a low acquaintance volume (41.5%) compared to only 15.6% low scorers on the A-V scale among blacks who attended black institutions. One explanation for these differences is in the size of the institutions. The black institutions have fewer matriculants with considerably smaller classes which, in turn, are not conducive to a high degree of anonymity and impersonality. Further, the all-black situation is more likely to result in frequent and more intense social interaction that is probably more intimate than that found in white institutions. In such institutions, blacks must be more assertive in establishing relationships even with other blacks (Table 25).

Table 25. Acquaintance Volume By Race of Graduate or Professional Institution, Number and Percent

Rank on A-V Scale	Race of Institution					
	Black		White		Row Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Low	5	15.6	50	41.5	55	35.9
Average	7	27.9	35	28.9	42	27.5
High	20	62.5	36	29.8	56	36.6
Column Total	32	20.9	121	79.1	153	100.0

Chi Square = 12.52; DF = 2; Significance = .001

Network Ties: The construction of a measure to determine the strength of network ties resulted in a trichotomized scale. The three levels of ties were strong, adequate and weak. This scale was labeled "Ties." An effort was made to determine the degree to which rank on the "Ties" scale was correlated with the variables of sex, age, collaboration with friends in professional activities, characteristics of undergraduate college, and the type of institutions from which the highest degree was received. As stated earlier on, the "ties scale" consisted of scores on the following four items: (1) the amount of time spent with most intimate friends, (2) companionship degree provided by members of the friendship group, (3) the degree of emotional support provided by friends, and (4) the degree of mutual confiding in friendship relationships.

The "Ties" scale showed that one-fourth of the respondents developed "strong" ties with their friends while in graduate or professional school. For slightly more than one-third (67.9%), "Adequate" ties characterized their social bonding with friends at that time. Only about one in fourteen respondents scored "weak" on the "Ties" scale. In the latter group, it may be assumed, are those persons who were for one of many reasons unable to establish important social relationships with other graduate or professional school students. These persons were undoubtedly unable to participate in social or study groups, informal clubs, voluntary associations and formal organizations, or they may have been isolated within the institution because of existing patterns of racial exclusion and discrimination. It is also possible that these eleven persons had other options external to the graduate or professional school setting and did not desire to confide in other students, seek them out for companionship, or rely upon them for emotional support. Albeit, their weak ties had no cohesive power.

As shown in Table 26, women and men were likely to report "adequate" to "strong" ties. Specifically, 53.5% scored "strong" on "Ties," and a mere 4.7 scored "weak" on the Ties scale. By contrast, almost three-quarters of the men (73.5%) scored "adequate:" 18.6% scored "strong" and only 8.0% scored or ranked "weak" on the Ties Scale. In effect, women are more likely to establish strong ties than men (Table 26).

Table 26. Strength of Ties by Sex, Number and Percent

Ties Category	Sex				Row Total
	Male		Female		
	N	%	N	%	
Strong Ties	21	18.6	18	41.9	39 (25.0%)
Adequate Ties	83	73.5	23	53.5	106 (67.9%)
Weak Ties	9	8.0	2	4.7	11 (7.1%)
Column Total	113 (72.4%)		43 (27.6%)		156 (100.0)

N = 156; Chi Square = 9.06; DF = 2; Significance = .0108

Age and Ties: With respect to age, which is measured by the period during which the baccalaureate degree was received, it appears that younger black persons were more effective in establishing strong ties than were older persons. In the overall analysis of this research, one must consider the fact that the respondents were called upon to make retrospective assessments. Their ability to recall critical events may be affected by the recency of these events, the impact of the relationships established on several dimensions of their social and professional life, the nature of the experiences, the intensity of relationships, the degree of trauma experienced by the absence of or the inability to establish meaningful social bonds, or by a tendency to romanticize or exaggerate the meanings attached to social relationships. Similarly, precisely because there were so few "friends," acquaintances, or casual encounters with a smiling face, black professionals in the earlier age cohorts may describe or assess their past with greater insight and with far greater precision and accuracy.

Of the persons in the pre-1950 cohort, which consisted of 29 persons and whose age is probably close to 60 or above, only 13.8% had "strong" ties but about one-fourth (75.9%) characterized their ties as "adequate." Approximately one-tenth (10.3%) described their ties as "weak." The 1950-59 cohort also included 29 persons from the sample. In this group, an even larger percent (82.8%) assessed their ties as "adequate" while about a tenth (10.3%) described them as "strong" and only one in sixteen (6.9%) characterized their ties as "weak." (Table 27).

Persons in the 1960-69 cohort are probably now in the early forties or late thirties, with respect to chronological age. They are, like persons in the last cohort (1970s and above), the products and beneficiaries of a time when there has been a tremendous emphasis on the need for establishing strong networks, social bonds, and consciousness-raising about issues of blackness, and the importance of living and "surviving" in a desegregating American society. Their views about their relationships with others are also affected by the immense stratification system within colleges and the invidious distinctions that many students now make between themselves and others based upon measures of social class. Consequently, black students are torn by competing values of egalitarianism and black identity versus the establishment of social relationships determined by social class values, parental background and prestige. Hence, there is a great deal of confusion among them with respect to a number of dimensions of networking (Table 27).

About one-third (32.7%) of the 55 persons who received their undergraduate degrees during the period between 1960 and 1969 and whose projected age is in the early forties or late thirties, assessed their ties as "strong." Over one-half (56.4%) described their ties as "adequate" while slightly more than one-tenth (10.9%) characterized their ties as "weak" during their period of graduate or professional school experience. The most dramatic observation about persons in the 1970 and beyond cohort, whose age is estimated to vary from the twenties to the early thirties, is the absence of persons who assessed their ties as "weak." More than two-thirds (68.2%) described their ties as "adequate" while another third (31.8%) believed them to have been "strong" (Table 27).

Table 27. Relationship Between Ties and Age Cohorts Measured By Period Baccalaureate Degree Received, Number and Percent

Strength of Ties	Period Baccalaureate Degree Received									
	Pre-1950		1950-59		1960-69		1970-83		Row Total	
	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.
Strong	4	13.8	3	10.3	18	32.7	14	31.8	39	24.8
Adequate	22	75.9	24	82.8	31	56.4	30	68.2	107	68.2
Weak	3	10.3	2	6.9	6	10.9	0	0.0	11	7.0
Column Total	29 (18.5%)		29 (18.5%)		55 (35.0%)		44 (28.0%)		157	100.0

Chi Square = 13.14; DF = 6; Significance = .0409

Ties and Collaboration and Professionals: Since it is assumed that persons with strong ties during graduate or professional school years might continue those relationships in a variety of settings thereafter, an attempt was made to measure the relationship between rank on the ties scale with collaboration as professionals. As shown in Table 28, about three-fifths of persons who responded to this item (59.7%) stated that they had collaborated with graduate or professional school friends since leaving the institution. Among those persons who had collaborated with friends, about one-third (32.6%) assessed their ties as "strong." More than three-fifths (61.6%) characterized their ties with graduate or professional school friends as "adequate" while slightly more than one in twenty (5.8%) described their ties as "weak." By contrast, among those persons who had never collaborated, 15.5% scored "strong" on the Ties scale; 75.9% scored "adequate" and 8.6% scored "weak" on this scale. Although the relationship, as measured by the Chi Square test, is slightly beyond the level of acceptability, it is nonetheless of value to note that persons who collaborate with their friends from graduate and professional school do tend to have stronger ties to them than those persons who do not. In essence, "collaboration" may yet prove to be an important index of the quality and strength of ties that individuals may have or may establish between themselves and persons known while they were pursuing an advanced degree (Table 28).

Table 26. Ties By Collaboration on Professional Endeavors With Graduate or Professional School Friends, Number and Percent

Strength of Ties	Degree of Collaboration					
	Yes		No		Row Total	
	N	Pct.	N	Pct.	N	Pct.
Strong	28	32.4	9	15.5	37	25.7
Adequate	53	61.6	44	75.9	97	67.4
Weak	5	5.8	5	8.6	10	6.9
Column Total	86 (59.7%)		58 (40.3%)		144	100.0

Chi Square = 5.34; DF = 2; Significance = .0689

With respect to the characteristics of the undergraduate college and the type of institution from which the highest degree was obtained, no statistically significant relationship was observed. Neither did the observed relationships even approach an acceptable level of statistical significance. Therefore, it does not appear, with respect to this sample, that institutional types are reliable predictors of the strength of ties individuals establish while in graduate or professional school.

Network Ties and Career Advancement: It was hypothesized that: "Strong network ties are equally effective in moving persons through and up in the system of professionals as is participation in the mentor-protegé dyad." This hypothesis is not confirmed. The relationship between the Ties scale and the Index of Occupational Status is not within the boundaries of acceptability (Table 29). However, as shown in Table 39,* there is a strong relationship between degrees of mentoring and rank on the index of occupations.

Table 29. TIES By Occupational Status, Number and Percent
Types of Present Occupation-Highest Positions Attained

Degree of Ties	Occupational Categories											
	Type I		Type II		Type III		Type IV		Type V		Row Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Strong	11	28.9	15	19.0	8	44.4	4	25.0	0	0	38	24.8
Average	24	63.2	57	72.2	10	55.6	12	75.0	1	50.0	104	68.0
Weak	3	7.9	7	8.9	0	0	0	0	1	50.0	11	7.2
Column Total	38	24.8	79	51.6	18	11.8	16	10.5	2	1.5	153	100.0

Chi Square = 13.45; DF = 8; Significance = .09

Type I = Physicians, Dentists, Lawyers, Optometrists and Engineers
Type II = High Level University Professionals (e.g., College Presidents, Provosts, Deans, Assistant to Full Professors.)
Type III = Other University Administrators (e.g., Affirmative Action Officers, Directors of Special Admissions, Financial Aid Officers, etc.)
Type IV = Presently enrolled students in the class of 1983
Type V = consultants, retired individuals, librarians

*See p. 104.

The Salience of Networks in Graduate or Professional School

The previous discussion has shown how the existence of networks in graduate or professional school is related to a number of important variables. Reflecting on their experiences, sometimes re-calling events that occurred almost a half-century ago, narratives given by several respondents provided important insights into problems involved in network building. Their responses demonstrate the ability of blacks in graduate or professional school to survive and become extremely successful under difficult situations.

For example, a seventy-three year old interviewee, who completed his graduate studies in 1941 from a northern, predominantly white institution, spoke of the absence of a critical mass of black students. At no time during his period of doctorate study was there one other black person in any of his courses. He was the only one of three blacks who received a doctorate from his institution that year. His acquaintance volume never exceeded ten black students and he knew no other black in his field. In the absence of a social network among fellow students, he and his wife relied heavily on social opportunities in the city for meeting social needs.

In many ways, this respondent was different from the more recent generations of blacks in graduate or professional school. However, he is more typical of many blacks from his generation in terms of the experiences brought into graduate or professional studies. For instance, he embarked upon his doctoral studies armed with two degrees from historically black colleges. At the age of 32, he had already taught at both the high school and college levels, and had served as a high school principal for two years. He was forbidden by law to pursue either college or university studies at a white institution in his home state; therefore, out of necessity, he was compelled to seek doctoral studies at a northern, predominantly white university. Although blacks were permitted to study there, only a handful were matriculated at any period of time. Hence, that "critical mass of black students" which is so highly valued in contemporary American society, was absent.

Although his doctoral studies were financed in part by a General Education Board Fellowship, his generation did not have the benefit of the plethora of financial assistance programs and scholarships presently available to graduate or professional students. In the absence of any semblance of a critical mass, there were no "buzz sessions," no "special study groups," no chapters of black professional organizations, and no extensive friendship groups on whom he could rely for psychological support. His wife was particularly important as a source of emotional support, companionship, friendship, as a sounding board for criticism and encouragement. Further, he knew that he had to draw heavily upon his inner reservoir of strength, determination and ability, and his sense of commitment in order to achieve his goals. He successfully completed his doctoral studies within two years beyond the Masters degree.

He taught himself French necessary for qualifying doctoral examinations and received special commendations for his mastery of that language. The Masters degree training in research methodology and statistics he had received at the (historically) black institution enabled him to successfully challenge the required statistics course for doctoral students. He completed his doctoral studies with an almost perfect "A" average.

The small world phenomenon was quite real in his experiences. At the time his doctoral studies were completed, there were less than 400 blacks in the United States with a doctorate. Because of the structure of prejudice, institutionalized discrimination and segregation, this respondent knew most blacks who held the doctoral degree. Inasmuch as these black professionals, like other black professionals, were excluded from membership in white associations, they formed their own formal organizations. These structures provided linkages that were of special salience and of significantly greater importance for the upward mobility of blacks than were roles performed by white professors at the institutions from which their doctorates were obtained. In essence, the small world of black professionals was the critical factor in the upward mobility they experienced throughout most of their professional life. That view was shared by many other men and women of his generation who participated in the study. In recent years, many of them have moved into desegregated occupational structures.

In the 1950s, by virtue of a number of legal victories in higher education won by the NAACP and the NAACP-LDF before the United States Supreme Court, (Bardolph, 1970; Blackwell, 1981; Greenberg, 1959), blacks began to enter graduate and professional schools in unprecedented numbers. Important changes in the character of networking among black students developed. Several such changes are observed in the experiences of another respondent interviewed for this study.

This respondent, like the first interviewee, is also a graduate of an historically black, private institution. Both served as President of an historically black college and, today, both are exceptionally active and highly sought by the corporate structure for their expertise as professionals. They are separated, however, by approximately twenty years of age and about five college generations.

Unlike the first interviewee, the second interviewee was one of two blacks "selected" to desegregate a private, historically white School of Law in the early 1950s. He and one other black male student, who was about fifteen years older than the interviewee, knew when they applied that several other blacks had been rejected for admission even though they qualified on all objective requirements. At least two of the rejected blacks enrolled in law schools elsewhere and, subsequently, became judges.

The interviewee and his associate entered a law school in which a significant number of white students and several white faculty opposed any effort at integration. However, they knew that they had the support of key figures in the administrative hierarchy and of several faculty within the institution. He comments about an encounter with three "liberal" white law students in the law library early in his first semester. These three white students who, perhaps, represented the "core of the liberal white student" network, informed him that they were "determined to make this thing work." One of them commented to the interviewee: "If you ever need a friend, we're going to be your friends." From that moment on, a bond of friendship was established that has continued for more than thirty years. All have become prominent in state politics and one has been an important political figure at the national level.

In this case, the black student became a part of what was essentially a liberal white student network. Most of the white students had fathers who were practicing attorneys. Consequently, they tended to use their fathers' law libraries for study sessions; the interviewee was included in them. White students checked out books from libraries that were not open to the interviewee for the interviewee's use. They also had access to old examinations which were shared with him during study sessions. Since the second black student who entered law school at the same time became a good friend and "something of a father figure," it was not unexpected that the two would provide mutual psychosocial support to each other. However, the respondent's entry into the network of liberal white students reinforced important affective or psychological support and enhanced the development of an important academic support system. This added dimension enabled him to compete on equal terms with white students who had access to different types of academic support structures (i.e., private law libraries, old examinations, viable study groups).

This patricular respondent, like most other persons interviewed for this study, saw important differences between himself and more recent generations of black graduate or professional school students. In the first instance, he says: "There was a lot of pressure on me to succeed. I knew that they were counting on us to demonstrate that students from our undergraduate college could perform as well as white students and that our college could be a good source for other black students for their law school." In effect, his viewpoint was that, by being selected to help desegregate a previously segregated law school, he had an entirely different mission and sense of responsibility than is necessary for most black students in 1983. He feels that although only two other black students entered the law school during his three years of study, he, his black classmate and those two students, paved the way for all those who were admitted and graduated in the late fifties, sixties, and thereafter.

The differences between black students of his generation and those of subsequent periods traverse a number of additional areas. In his view:

> "It is probably more difficult to succeed today than it was in the 1950s. It is probably more difficult to form the kinds of relationships that facilitate success in a graduate or professional school because of a number of reasons. First, there is a kind of interpersonal gestalt that operates today. So many white students are so concerned about "self" that they will not extend themselves to be helpful to black students. Second, many black students do not know how to reach out to each other; yet they need each other. Sometimes black students will read "race" into situations that have nothing to do with

> race. If they were a part of a network with people who are honest with them, those friends could help them look at the situation with a more objective view and not see race where it is unimportant. Third, it is even more important for black students to have networks that enable them to expand out into the whole graduate or professional system, to share information, to create alliances between or with white networks that are of mutual benefit to black networks. I also think that the post-graduate networks (those formed after leaving a graduate or professional school) are critical. They are critical for information sharing, for the development of important resources and to render it easier to advance goals and careers."

This respondent is convinced that the extended network in which he was able to participate, which included not only his white liberal friends in law school but black law students at other institutions, has been the most important instrument in his career development. It opened up innumerable doors for him, broadened his professional contacts, and has facilitated the acquisition of resources vital for the enrichment of learning programs at the institution for which he served so effectively as President.

When all respondents were queried as to how black students can build viable graduate or professional school networks, their replies focused on essentially four somewhat overlapping areas: (1) to recognize the need for networks and understand the importance of collective action as opposed to individual effort, (2) a need to share information regarding power bases, references, sponsors and advisors, and (4) a need to maintain contact with established networks during and following graduate or professional school training.

Some persons provided detailed lists of procedures, prescriptions or possible actions vital for the establishment of viable networks. These include the following suggestions:

"1. Attend/organize inter-campus black student conferences in order to share/learn from experiences of other black students, i.e., academic bureaucracy, "survival" techniques, professional ideological development, etc.;
2. Organize black-faculty-student clusters for social-business sessions around black academic interests;
3. Stay in touch with national and local black community issues, re: professional field."

A second respondent said:

"1. Have regular meetings of discussion groups with particular departments or courses;
2. Have regular symposia on research issues involving black faculty and graduate students;
3. Continue these activities over a 5-10 year period to establish a tradition."

Another suggested that black students should:

"1. Break out of the shell of thinking only in terms of black/white;
2. Seek out faculty for advice and assistance, and make an effort to know them outside the classroom;
3. Try each term to cultivate three or more classmates and collaborate with them on study or other projects;
4. Join and be active in professional societies and interest groups; and
5. Get serious about scholarship."

With respect to recognizing the need for networks and collective action as opposed to individual effort, the following responses are representative:

> "I believe that black students must learn to use each other as a means of support. Too many times did I find that the "ego" of black students helped to tear apart any sense of community we had. Although each student is an individual and is pursuing their (sic) own field of interest, there needs to be a better sense of community which can only be built on trust and the respect for others. Black students also need a sound direction. I feel that black faculty could help a great deal by helping students form a direction in their career life planning. This in itself could also produce a strong network. I also feel that black students must take their education to heart. Graduate school is not a place to "just get by," but an environment which helps to build the intellect and develop additional skills within an area of specialization. These are just my general views, but as a graduate student at a white public institution, I can state that the major resource needed in building a strong network was black faculty and mentors. Iowa State did not have one black faculty member in any department."

Other respondents said:

> ..."Recognize the need and value of networks. The situation is vastly different from that which I encountered at the University of Texas. I was among the first blacks to attend and there were very few blacks in attendance. With the exception of two courses, I was the only black student. Young blacks can find a support system now and those of us who have gone before them can help them."

Another said:

> ..."By first of all, recognizing the need for such; secondly, by understanding that survival is a collective and not an individual matter. Thirdly, by learning to be supportive and secure within the network and not competitive (at least not internally)."

Representative comments concerning the need to communicate and to be mutually supportive include the following:

> "Because I did not have the benefit of a network in graduate school, it is difficult for me to identify all the components which make up a strong network among black students. The most significant components to me are mutual respect and support among black students regardless of the field of academic study. Some of it is being comfortable with being black. It is extremely difficult to be supportive of other blacks when they do everything they can to deny their blackness."

Another commented:

> "Just being friendly and open. I found the academic snobbery to be the biggest problem in graduate school. The Harvard students looked down on everyone else and the B.U. students tried to look down on everyone except the Harvard students. Further, the prestige of the undergraduate institutions and family background were also very much overemphasized by black students. Black students should simply be open and respectful to any and every other black student in the academic community in which he/she is functioning. Ten years later, none of the 'prestige' criteria makes any difference."

Another said...."Communicate! Develop mutual dialogues. Students should be prepared to share resources with each other. Black students should not limit themselves to just Black but interact with a broad spectrum of the campus community."

Yet another commented:

"Develop both formal and informal support networks both by discipline and interdisciplines. Seek sponsorships and mentorship of Black professors and Administrators. Communicate with fellow black students at nearby institutions (universities-to expand support network, share information, etc)."

Others commented:

"Concentrate on developing study groups; sharing information, learning to cooperate; work on joint intellectual projects."

And ...."Establish and maintain strong black student organizations on campus. Promote and foster relationships between black students and white students, and black and white faculty members who are sympathetic and interested in black student interests. Maintain strong ties with appropriate civic and community groups, and develop and maintain relationships with black graduate students and organizations at other campuses. Have campus newspaper."

In the same vein, another respondent commented that networks can be built: "simply by encouraging one another to make his/her strongest effort toward remaining as a close friend. Otherwise, so-called networking is largely a myth." However, another respondent took a different view as suggested in the following comment:

> "Become less self-centered. Develop skills in open communication with other Blacks and others showing support. Increase participation with black organizations (academic and non-academic)...."

This view was shared by the respondent who admonished blacks to:

> "communicate. Practice makes perfect! Develop strong group support for personal and academic excellence for all concerned."

This category of suggestions is further represented by similar suggestions from other respondents who said:

> "Black students must first come out of the shells that graduate and professional schools force upon them to meet other black graduates and undergraduates across disciplines. This can be easiest accomplished through taking advantage of opportunities to teach undergraduates, do independent workshops, form study groups, or advise undergrad and grad organizations."

> "Black students must learn to work together in order to use the academic system, while avoiding the label "isolationists," In addition, they should become active participants in the activities of the graduate/professional organizations."

> "Make a concerted effort to speak to one another and discuss ....their goals, objectives, and obstacles. Seek to obliterate the mistrust that seems to be there."

Several respondents suggested the importance of sharing information, especially information about power bases, references, sponsors and advisors. The following comments are representative of this category:

"Create formal Black Clubs or associations. Hold regular meetings. Exchange problems, frustrations, successes and facilitate some sense of security, inter-personal relations and academic aid as fraternities and sororities have traditionally done."

"Know the influential people in school - faculty and students working together but not isolating themselves (sharing). Participate in all phases of academic life. Become known to your professors. Do more than the minimum."

"Learn the system and know how it works."

"They must put aside any petty jealousies and openly and honestly work together and help each other. We all have some strengths and weaknesses; so, if we are together we can benefit from all those strengths and minimize the weaknesses."

"Black students need to, in general, give up looking to whites for approval. As long as students are in a competition for help or information or any type of real assistance, they are doomed to failure!!!! White students are too self-centered and concerned about their own success to be helpful to us."

"Learn to identify the loci of power in the institutions. Identify information banks that non-minority students tap - get involved in the life of the institutions as much as possible. Hopefully, black faculty who are sensitive to black student needs will serve as sounding boards for perceptive assessments."

"Through friendship, sharing, and by being concerned about other black students."

"They must use organizations..that they have organized and control to cope with problems encountered while matriculating and those that emerge after graduation. In addition, personal relationships must be maintained for individual assistance and necessary information."

A certain amount of ambivalence or uncertainty as to how to build strong networks was noted by the respondent who said:

"I am not sure what can be done. I do feel such networks are most beneficial within disciplines, that is, when there are large numbers of black students pursuing the same academic interests. There were never more than three black students in my department, and I was the only black student during the last two years of my doctoral work. Although I had black friends in other academic areas, I did not have the kind of support enjoyed by blacks in areas with larger black enrollments.

I tend to value networks that begin with groups of students in the same discipline on the same campus. I do recognize the value of black professional groups. As a student I was a member of a black special interest group in the American Educational Research Association. However, such professional organizations do not (and cannot) address the pressing academic concerns that black students face while in graduate school. Matters

> such as judicious selection of doctoral committee members and academic advisors, for example, can only be handled at the local level."

Others emphasized a number of factors apparently directed toward personal responsibility and accountability among blacks for controlling their own fate. Among such comments were the following: (1) "By being first and foremost excellent students, sharing strong, disciplined study habits with one another, and working on projects with both black and white students." (2) "By being serious about what they are doing and giving whites a chance. They can be very helpful in many cases." (3) "Find a black faculty person or administrator who can serve as a mentor or liaison person. Also find another black student in the same program and try to work out a buddy system. Participate in minority graduate recruitment programs that are offered at some institutions." and (4) "Keep old tests... Be willing to 'put yourself out' to help a student. Share notes, anecdotes, opinions of how certain instructors relate to blacks. It really helped me to know that the treatment I received was the result of the professor's 'problem' and that I was 'okay.' I knew because blacks before me had warned me of his racist behavior."

Clearly, networking experiences of blacks vary by a number of dimensions identified in this chapter. Although no statistically significant correlations were shown between networking and some factors perceived as important, the narrative data provided by the respondents revealed a number of important situations relative to both the establishment and maintenance of viable networks. Irrespective of time and place, it is evident that a special effort is required to participate in institutional networks. Participants seem to be divided in terms of whether or not the networks ought to be race-specific, racially exclusive or racially inclusive. Albeit, there seems to be a certain consensus in the belief that network participation is of critical importance for facilitating a smooth positive development as graduate or professional students. There is also the belief that networking makes it considerably easier to advance one's own career and professional goals.

Generated Hypotheses

This discussion on networking has revealed a number of important hypotheses that could be tested by a large scale, more detailed, and a much broader-based sample. Such hypotheses include the following:

1. Black and white students will show no difference with respect to establishing viable institutional networks while in graduate or professional school.
2. The types of networks established by black and white students will differ along such dimensions as (a) academic networks within institutions, (b) social networks while in school, and (c) involvement in faculty-student networks.
3. Among black students, the quality and strength of network ties may be dependent upon such factors as the following: (a) acquaintance volume among white students, institutional type, (c) institutional size, (d) sex of participants, (e) age of participants, and (f) by the major field of study.
4. Irrespective of race, stronger networks will be established by persons enrolled in professional schools in comparison with persons enrolled in graduate doctoral programs.
5. Having a supportive psychological and social environment will be viewed as considerably more significant in network building among black students in black institutions than among

white students in predominantly white institutions.

6. The institutional climate of public, graduate or professional schools is more conducive to the establishment and maintenance of viable networks among blacks than is the institutional climate found at private, graduate or professional schools.
7. The institutional climate of black graduate or professional schools is more conducive to the establishment and maintenance of viable networks than the institutional climate observed at white graduate or professional schools.
8. The larger the number of blacks enrolled in a graduate or professional school the greater will be the participation of blacks in all-black networks while the smaller the number of black matriculated in a graduate or professional school the more likely will be the involvement of blacks in predominantly white networks within the institution.

CHAPTER V

BLACK FACULTY, ROLE MODELS AND MENTORING

Networking and social ties are but one collection of factors that may be critical in making assessments of the quality of graduate or professional school experiences for black Americans. Other issues of, perhaps, equal importance center around the presence or absence of black faculty, role models, and the degree of participation in the mentor-protegé relationship. In this chapter, the latter three issues are explored. However, primary focus is on mentoring and variables that appeared to have been associated with mentoring for participants.

Black Faculty

Since the late 1960s and early 1970s, a great deal of attention has been called to the underrepresentation of black faculty, administrators and staff in predominantly white colleges and universities (Blackwell, 1981; Morris, 1979; and Pruitt, 1981). This problem is not only one of numerical representation but is also one of uneven distribution of black faculty in the various disciplines. As a result, it is not unexpected that blacks are totally absent in some disciplines, departments or professional fields at many institutions. Consequent to student pressures and demands for more black faculty and the promulgation of affirmative action guidelines for higher education in 1972, followed by some degree of enforcement, larger numbers of black faculty and administrators have been hired in predominantly white institutions. In theory, this change has created more exposure of students, black and non-black, to black professors and administrators in white institutions. In practice, the situation may be decidedly different.

Participants in this study were queried as to the presence or absence of black faculty members in their own department or field of study. Almost forty percent (39.5%) stated that there were no blacks teaching in any capacity, full-or-part-time, in their department or field. On the other hand, slightly more than forty percent (42.8%) reported that blacks were teaching full-time in their departments. Another 5.9% stated that blacks were hired as part-time members of the department while 11.8% indicated that blacks were hired exclusively as adjunct members of the department (Table 30).

Table 30. Presence or Absence of Black Faculty in Respondents' Major Department or Field of Study by Number and Percent

Capacity of Black Faculty	N	Percent
Yes, Full-Time	65	42.8
Yes, But Part-Time	9	5.9
Only as Adjunct Teachers	18	11.8
No Black Faculty	60	39.5
Total	152	100.0

Inasmuch as the framing of the question did not permit the respondent to give a precise number of blacks who were teaching in the major department, no determination can be made at this juncture as to whether or not the black faculty presence represented anything beyond tokenism. However, the evidence provided here is confirmatory of the fact that, since only a fraction of the respondents in this study received their graduate and professional training at predominantly black institutions, many predominantly white institutions have hired at least one black faculty member. Indeed, tokenism is the norm of most predominently white institutions (Blackwell, 1981). Further, the fact that an almost equal number of respondents reported the absence of black faculty as the presence of full-time blacks in the major department is unequivocal evidence that much more hiring of blacks is absolutely necessary in predominantly white colleges and universities.

Role Models

Role models are persons one seeks to emulate or whose behavior, patterns of living, professional achievements, values, and normative standards are used as the framework for determining one's own goals and patterns of living. Many different persons may serve in the role modeling capacity including parents, teachers, college and university professors, professionals in the community, national and community leaders, and significant others who may be only figures from history. Although conventional wisdom perpetuates the belief that persons who serve as role models ought to be in relatively close physical proximity to the individual, that may or may not be the case. It is possible that some individuals may take as their role models persons whom they have enountered only through reading. In fact, one respondent commented that his most important role models were famous black activists such as Paul Robeson, Marcus Garvey and Malcolm X. Many persons believe that individuals may, in fact, use more than one person for modeling purposes. In this instance, role modeling may become segmental. That is to say, individuals may look to persons who perform highly divergent roles for specific dimensions of their behavior or accomplishments as the bases for fashioning anticipated and expected goal attainments and social or professional conduct.

Not only do diverse situations call for different types of role models but they may also dictate the race and sex of the person emulated. Hence, the person selected as the role model may or may not be of either the same race or of the same sex. Further, for a great variety of reasons, some individuals may never develop role models in the traditional sense of the term.

Participants in this study were asked a series of questions about role models and their perceived specific characteristics. As shown in Table 31, slightly less than one fifth (18.8%) stated that they did not have a role model. Even fewer, 17.4%, said that they had at least one person who was a role model to them. It seems significant that almost two-thirds of these respondents claimed to have two or more role models. This fact does indeed suggest segmentation of role modeling functions. The mean number of role models was 3.6 while the median was 3.1 (Table 31).

When questioned about the location of and race of their most significant role model while in graduate or professional school, white professors in the major field were reported more than twice as frequently as black professors in the major field as the respondent's role model. Even when all blacks selected as role models, whether professors in the major field, blacks in clinical programs, black professors outside the major department or black administrators in the university, the total of blacks neither equals nor surpasses the total number of whites specified as role models while in graduate or professional school (Table 32). It is only when community professionals are included and specified that the absolute number of blacks identified as role models exceeds the absolute number of whites who served in this capacity for blacks during that period.

A series of questions posed to the respondents was designed to elicit information about the nature of the relationships between the respondents and faculty members, irrespective of race, while in graduate or professional school. For instance, they were asked whether or not a particular member had played an important role in their development while in graduate or professional school. Of the 153 persons who responded to this item, 85% said "yes" and 15% said "no." Respondents were also asked whether or not they had established a

Table 31. Number of Role Models Reported While in Graduate or Professional School By Percent

Number of Role Models Reported	N	Percent
None	28	18.8
One	26	17.4
Two	34	22.8
Three	31	20.8
Four	11	7.4
Five	7	4.7
Six	4	2.7
Seven	2	1.3
Eight or more	6	4.0
Total	149	100.0

Mean = 3.6 Median = 3.1

****

Table 32. Most Significant Role Models While In Graduate or Professional School by Race, Field, Number and Percent

Category	N	Percent
Black Professor in My Major	20	14.9
Black Professor in Clinical Program	15	11.2
Black Professor Outside Department	6	4.5
White Professor in My Major	49	36.6
White Prof. in Clinical Program	4	3.0
White Professors Outside Department	2	1.5
Black Administrators in University*	5	3.7
Community Professionals	12	9.0
Other**	21	15.7
Total	134	100.0

*Community Professionals included people respondents had either come to know on a personal level or whose reputation was well known to them as they lived in the nearby community.

**Other included most frequently family members (especially father and/or mother, other relatives), friends of family, black professors from their undergraduate colleges, civil rights activists , political and literary figures.

strong relationship with a faculty member during their graduate or professional school studies. Of the 157 persons who answered this question, about three-fifths (69.4%) answered in the affirmative while three tenths (30.6%) responded negatively. (Tables 33 and 34).

Table 33. Faculty Role in Development While in Graduate or Professional School, Number and Percent

Category Response	Did Faculty Play a Role in Your Development while in Grad/Prof. School?	
	N	Pct.
Yes	130	85
No	23	15
Total	153	100.0

Table 34 . Relationship With Faculty While in Graduate or Professional School, Number and Percent

Response Category	Did You have A Strong Relationship With Faculty During Grad/Prof. School?	
	N	Pct.
Yes	109	69.4
No	48	30.6
Total	157	100.0

An effort was also made to determine whether or not the persons identified as important in their professional development or with whom they had a strong relationship were among their professional role models. Approximately one-third (66.2%) said that these persons were indeed among their professional role models. One-third (33.8%) did not identify among their role models either persons who played a role in their development or with whom they formed a strong relationship during graduate or professional school.

Strong relationships between black students and graduate or professional school faculty members originate in a variety of settings or circumstances.

More often than not, they begin when faculty members perform an advisory role for the students, whether as a general advisor, or thesis/dissertation advisor or supervisor in a clinical setting. This was the method by which 24.8 percent of the respondents indicated that their strong relationship with faculty developed. In other instances, though not necessarily unrelated to the first explanation, the reputation of the student as an excellent student or of because of special characteristics of the student, a faculty member may have taken a special interest in the student. This factor was reported by 21.1% of the respondents. That interest may have been sparked by the fact that the student enrolled in one or more courses with a particular professor or the student and faculty met in an internship setting. This method for establishing a strong relationship was reported by 15.6% of the participants in this study.

Far less frequently do such relationships begin before the student enters graduate or professional school (4.6%), or by virtue of the student seeking out a particular professor because others have recommended him/her (3.7%), or through such situations as team teaching or student participation in staff activities (3.7%), or by the student serving as a research assistant (6.4%), or through mutual acquaintances (2.9%). In about 14% of the cases, a combination of these factors provided the special context within which strong relationships between black graduate or professional school students and faculty were formed.

Essentially, then, role models selected by black students do vary across a number of dimensions. Their selection is dictated by a variety of special circumstances and conditions. Nevertheless, it does not appear likely that blacks are in sufficient number of professional roles to be in a position to be selected most frequently by black students.

Characteristics of Most Important Persons: In retrospect, the respondents had particularly positive perceptions of the power, influence and respect enjoyed by their "most important persons" in the department, university and profession. For instance, whereas 8.3% stated their most important persons "had little power and influence" within the major department, almost one-third (31.8%) believed they were persons of major power and infuence at that level. Another 31.2% characterized them as persons with "some power and influence" in the department. About a fifth (20.4%) stated that these persons were not members of their major department.

The participants were similarly inclined to view their most important persons during graduate or professional school as persons with "some" power and influence in the university (40.8%), and of "some" influence in their profession (43.3%), and to enjoy enormous respect by their departmental colleagues (77.1%), as well as high respect from otherstudents (75.2%). Further, about seven of every ten respondents (70.7%) stated that they believed their most important persons were well-respected in their profession.

While these ratings of the most important person seem particularly positive, coupled with the fact that less than ten percent of the participants indicated they had some degree of difficulty in obtaining an advisor, one might expect higher scores on the mentor scale. However, only about 12.7% of the respondents had mentors. This situation suggests that, even with all the power, influence, prestige and respect enjoyed by the most important person, there was little transfer of these attributes into those functions associated with mentor-protegē relationships.

Instead, the majority of the respondents characterized their most important persons during graduate and professional school as either sponsors or advisors/teachers/peers. In the case of peers, as shown in Table 42, a positive and significant relationship existed between the Ties and Mentor scales.

Mentoring and Blacks

One major purpose of this study was to identify factors that may be correlated with mentoring. As was stated earlier on, a trichotomized variable, called Scale (or mentoring) was constructed based upon cumulative scores on twenty-three items. Descriptive statistics and the chi square test were utilized to test seven hypotheses identified in Chapter III and which were assumed to shed light on the mentoring process as experienced by blacks while in graduate or professional school.

Since the term mentor was not explicitly defined for the participants, they were asked to focus attention on the one person whom they regarded as "their most important person while in graduate or professional school." Then, each respondent answered a lengthy series of questions that facilitated the testing of the seven hypotheses and which helped to understand not only the characteristics of persons who participate in varying degrees of mentoring but the respondents' own perception of their own involvement in the mentoring process.

Persons who scored at the highest level on Scale were assumed to have had "mentors" while persons who scored in the second level were believed to have had "sponsors" who, in terms of observations in the literature rank just below mentors with respect to the kinds of functions they perform to a potential protegē. All scores in the bottom portion on Scale were labeled "advisors, teachers, and , possibly, peers," In fact, many persons stated uncategorically that since they never had formal advisors, they relied most heavily upon peers for essentially mentoring, sponsoring and/or advising functions. The data analysis revealed that mentoring is not as pervasive as many persons would imagine - at least in the experience of the 157 participants in this study. Among all participants, the responses provided and scores observed on Scale indicated that only 20 persons, representing a mere 12.7% of the sample had mentors while in graduate or professional school. This finding suggests that only one in eight participants had mentors as determined by the kinds of expected functions mentors perform. Indeed, more than three times as many persons, 71 or 45.5% of the total, had "sponsors" and slightly more than three times as many, 65 or 41.7%, identified the functional equivalent of an advisor, or teacher, or another peer as their most important person while in graduate or professional school.

These findings also suggest that true mentors are difficult to acquire for black students. They appear to be more likely, almost evenly so, to be aided or directed by sponsors, teachers, advisors and peers than by mentors while in graduate or professional school. This finding also raises another important question about mentoring: Is mentoring largely a myth or is it a peculiarity of certain situations and circumstances?

Correlates of Mentoring: It was hypothesized that: "The participation of black students in the mentor protegé relationship varies by time and the location of the institution in which graduate/professional training was received." Specifically, (a) the younger the person the less likely is participation in the mentor-protegé relationship, and (b) blacks who received undergraduate degrees from northern, predominantly white institutions are less likely to participate in the mentor-protegé relationship than are blacks who received undergraduate degrees from historically black colleges. As shown in Table 35 , mentoring is not significantly correlated with age cohorts. More respondents are clustered in the later age groups; however, that is strictly an artifact of their numerical representation in the sample and nothing more.

Table 35 . Mentoring by Age Cohort, Number and Percent

Mentoring Category	Age Determined by Year of Undergrad Degree									
	Pre-1950		1950-1959		1960-1969		1970-1983		Row Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mentor	2	6.9	3	10.3	8	14.5	7	15.9	20	12.7
Sponsor	11	37.9	13	44.8	24	43.6	23	52.3	71	45.2
Advisors, Teachers and Peers	16	55.2	13	44.8	23	41.8	14	31.8	66	42.0
Column Total	29	18.5	29	18.5	55	35.0	44	28.0	157	100.0

Chi Square = 4.58; DF = 6; Significance = .5975

However, when age groups are collapsed into persons who received their highest degrees prior to 1960 and those who received their highest degrees since 1960, important distinctions on the mentoring scale are observed (Table 36).

Table 36 . Mentoring by Period in Which Highest Degree Awarded

Mentoring Category	Period Highest Degree Awarded					
	Pre-1960		Post 1960		Row Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mentor	4	7.8	16	15.1	20	12.7
Sponsor	18	35.3	53	50.0	71	45.2
Advisor, Teacher/Peer	29	56.7	37	34.9	66	42.0
Column Total	51	32.5	106	67.5	157	100.0

Chi Square = 7.01; DF = 2; Significance = .0299

Although this re-arrangement of cohorts does produce some degree of support for the relationship between age and mentoring participation, it is probably not a true measure of age per se. Rather, it is probably a more accurate representation of the degree to which the social and economic contexts of the time in which the degree was conferred influenced more white professors to take cognizance of the needs of black as well as white students. Persons who received their graduate or professional training in the pre-1960 period were more likely to characterize their "most important person" as an advisor, teacher or peer than was the case for persons who received their training in the more recent years. In the latter case, 50 percent rated their most important person in the category while 15.1% had mentors. The difference between the two groups may be partially explained by greater numbers of blacks enrolled in graduate and professional schools and by the presence of faculty that may have become more sensitized to the fact that black students have the same needs for guidance as white students. It is also possible that blacks in the older age cohorts did not enter graduate or professional school with anticipated favorable responses from white professors and were, therefore, more independent and self-reliant than younger age cohorts.

There was no confirmation for the hypothesis that blacks who received undergraduate degrees from northern, predominantly white institutions are less likely to participate in the mentor-protegé relationship than are blacks who received undergraduate degrees from historically black colleges. As shown in Table 37, the relationship between degrees of mentoring is not significantly related to the location of the undergraduate college. Although the respondents were about evenly divided in terms of location of their undergraduate institution, they were indistinguishable with respect to the degree of mentoring experienced during their graduate or professional education.

Table 37. Mentoring By Location and Racial Characteristics of Undergraduate Institution

Mentoring Category	Location of Undergraduate Institution					
	Historically Black		Northern Predom. White		Row Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mentor	10	13.5	8	10.7	18	12.1
Sponsor	36	48.6	32	42.7	68	45.6
Advisor, Teacher/Peer	28	37.8	35	46.7	63	42.3
Column Total	74	49.7	75	50.3	149	100.0

Chi Square = 1.22; DF = 2; Significance =.5410

It was further hypothesized that blacks who attended a black graduate/professional school are more likely to have participated in the mentor-protegē relationship than are blacks who received their training at a predominantly white graduate/professional school. As shown in Table 38, this hypothesis is not supported by the findings.

Table 38. Mentoring By Racial Characteristics of Graduate or Professional School

Rank on Mentor Scale	Race on Grad/Prof School					
	Historically Black		Traditionally White		Row Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mentor	2	6.3	17	14.0	19	12.4
Sponsor	12	37.3	58	47.9	70	45.8
Advisor, Teacher, Peer	18	56.3	46	38.0	64	41.8
Column Total	32	20.9	121	79.0	153	100.0

Chi Square = 3.85; DF = 2; Significance = .1456

Although the relationship between rank on the mentor scale and the racial composition of the graduate or professional school is not significant, important observations are made in Table 38 . For instance, a higher percentage of blacks who went to white institutions had mentors than was observed among those who went to black institutions. However, a considerably higher percentage of blacks who were graduated from historically black colleges and universities can be said to have had advisors, teachers and peers to guide them than was the case among those blacks who were graduated from traditionally white institutions.

The data presented in Tables 37 and 38 confirm the hypothesis that "blacks are more likely to have been involved in a relationship that is less intensive than mentoring, such as a sponsor student, advisor-student, or perhaps peer relationship. The numerical and percentage distributions previously described of the respondents in the mentoring scale show, once again, that only about one-eight of all participants in this study can be said to have had mentors. An almost equal number of respondents can be said to have had sponsors (71) as had advisors and peers (65) during their training in graduate or professional school. Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted.

Mentoring and Career Advancement: It was hypothesized that blacks who did participate in the mentor-protegē relationship will show greater advancement with respect to career development (i.e., reported present occupation) than those blacks who did not have that experience. Perhaps, the most effective method of testing this hypothesis would have been to track the career pattern of each respondent over time and to demonstrate upward mobility trends with respect to both changes in occupational status and improvements income. Inasmuch as this study was constrained by the limitations of most exploratory studies, that process was not fully followed. Instead each respondent was queried as to what is the highest position you have ever attained? In almost all instances, "present occupation" was listed. That variable, therefore, became the measure of career advancement. Responses to that question were grouped into a modified Blau-Duncan Index of Occupational Status and given the associated ranks. Relationships between degrees of mentoring and rank on the index of occupational status are reported in Table 39. These relationships are statistically significant.

Among physicians, dentists and lawyers, only 9.1% had mentors. In fact, physicians, dentists and lawyers, moreso than any other group seemed to have relied upon advisors, teachers and peers. Proportionately, other status groups were more likely to indicate that they had mentors. The prominent exceptions to this generalization were higher level university administrators and students in the class of 83. No person in the latter groups scored at the mentor level on the Mentor Scale. In both instances, high level university administrators were more likely than not to score in a manner as to suggest that their most important person in graduate or professional school could best be called a sponsor. Importantly, it is the relationship between the mentor and occupational scales that is significant.

Mentoring After Graduate or Professional School: It is implied in some of the expressions of the importance of mentors, as well as in the literature, that mentors sometimes play crucial roles in the protegē's life after leaving graduate or professional school. Further, it may be inferred from the paucity of actual mentors identified in this study, that other persons may perform even more invaluable functions to an individual than do mentors after leaving a graduate or professional school. A Post-Graduate Professional School Function scale (called PGPF scale) was developed from the 20 items listed in question number 55 (See Appendix). The PGPF scale, a continuous variable, was tested for its relationship with the mentor scale. The Pearson r between these two

Table 39 . Mentoring by Occupational Status, Number and Percent

Mentoring Category	Types of Present Occupations - Highest Positions Attained												Row Total	
	Physicians, Dentists, Lawyers, other Profes.		High Level Univ. Persons[a]		Other Univ. Administrators[b]		Current Student		Librarian		Retired Consultants			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mentor	3	9.1	0	0	12	15.2	0	0	1	50.0	4	25.0	20	13.1
Sponsor	7	21.2	3	60.0	42	53.2	13	72.2	0	0	5	31.3	70	45.8
Advisors, Teachers, Peers	23	69.7	2	40.0	25	31.6	5	27.8	1	50.0	7	43.8	63	41.2
Column Total	33	21.6	5	3.3	79	51.6	18	11.8	2	1.3	16	10.5	153	100.0

Chi Square = 26.53; DF = 10; Significance = .0031

a = High level University Persons included college presidents, deans, provosts, professors and other high level administrators

b = Other University Administrators include affirmative action officers, directors, special admissions staff, financial aid directors, etc.

variables was .41 which was significant at the .001 level. HENCE, IT APPEARS, AT LEAST FOR THIS SAMPLE, THAT HIGH PERFORMANCE AS A MENTOR WHILE IN GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL LEADS TO HIGH MENTORING FUNCTIONS after graduation.

A further examination of this relationship was posed as: "Comparing the person who was the most important in your development and progress as a student with persons you would describe as a mentor whom you met later in your career, which would have been the most important to you?" The same number of persons, 27, (20.6%) stated that professional colleagues met later in life have been most important in their career development as persons identified as most important during graduate or professional school.

Importance of Mentors: Although only about 12.7% of the respondents had mentors, and about 10% stated that mentors were of little or no importance to blacks in graduate or professional school, about 90 percent were unequivocal in their belief that mentors are of "some" to "greatest" importance. About 45% indicated mentors are of "greatest importance" to black/minority students. Respondents who believed mentors to be of importance used such expressions as "crucial," "no mentor no professional!", and "they hold the key to a better life."

This finding seems somewhat corroborated by responses given to the question: How important have the following factors been in your career development up to this point? (Question 56 on Questionnaire in Appendix A). Respondents were given five choices for each item. The choices ranged from "of little or no importance" to "first" in importance. With respect to college mentors, only 22.9% rated them as first importance while 29.8% s[illegible] that they had been "of little or no importance" in their career development up to the present time. Regarding persons referred to by respondents as "graduate or professional school advisor," 14.6% rated them "first" while 25.5% rated them as of little or no importance up to this point in their career development.

Although only12.7% of them scored sufficiently high on the mentor scale as to be judged to have had mentors during their graduate or professional school years, 26.1% stated that persons whom "they" would call mentors during that period were "first" in importance in their career development. By contrast, 15.9% stated that these persons were of little or no importance. One explanation for this apparent contradiction is that retrospective assessments may be somewhat clouded by situational differences over time frames. It may also be probable that many of the persons labeled "sponsors" during the graduate or professional school period may have performed essentially mentoring functions for the individual respondents over the years since graduation. Slightly more than one-fourth (27.3%) of all persons labeled "post-Grad/Professional School Mentors" ranked first in terms of the respondents' assessments.

The findings with respect to the role performed by "friends" and "friends of friends" have some implications for degrees of networking experienced after leaving school. For instance, close friends while in graduate/professional school were given a rating of "first" in importance by 25.4% while 12.1% of the respondents stated that they were of little or no importance. Only 4.5% of individuals regarded as "friends of friends" were rated first while 36.9% were thought of as of little or no importance for their career advancement up to the present time. Similarly, a comparatively low rating was given to members of social clubs. Only 7.0% of persons in this category scored first but 37.6% of them rated of little or no importance. By contrast, professional associates scored higher than friends of friends. Among professional associates, 20.6% were rated first and only 12.1% were rated of little or no importance in the respondents' career advancement.

Comments made by respondents relative to the importance of mentors were illuminating with respect to their perceptions of the functions performed by mentors at that time as well as in the future. A few illustrative comments provide further insight into the respondents' thoughts on this issue:

1. "My mentor had a great perception for the need of aspiring young leaders in their field. Thus, she established a relationship which was friendly and open. The value of this was that we were both free to express professional opinions. When my logic, reasoning, or statement of facts was more valid, she acknowledged. However, I was perfectly aware that she was more an authority and I listened and learned. She devoted many hours working along with me."
2. "Mentors are of the utmost importance to black/minority students at this level. Mentors can help to bridge the gap between college (or high school) where the student gets more attention and assistance and this advanced level where friends are likely to be fewer in number and where independent work is more prevalent and complex. Additionally, black students are less likely to have had prior experience or exposure to such activities. This could result in serious emotional maladjustments as well as social ones. A sincere, congenial and cordial mentor can help alleviate such problems."
3. "They (mentors) are of vital importance because minority students, often in a 'sea of whiteness,' feel isolated and alienated from the mainstream environment." This particular view is further illuminated by the respondent who commented that:

4. "The demand of graduate school leaves very little time for socializing. Coming from a predominantly Anglo-American Graduate School in up-state New York, I was often depressed, alone, lonely, angry, hostile towards the blatant acts of racism experienced as a graduate student. I was often shocked at the ignorance of Anglo-Americans. It became a positive learning experience for me when I realized how far more sophisticated, humanistic, positive, value oriented, responsible, emotionally/psychologically prepared, stable and focused the overwhelming majority of Black students were in the Atlanta U. Center than both Black and white students were at * . Black students coming to graduate school at a predominantly white school must learn how to create positive experiences in their lives, to find ways of meeting their social needs (this may require looking outside the immediate school environment) to find a spiritual/religious support and outlet and establish support groups)."
5. "Mentors are important in order to help a black student cope with the negative stereotypes that whites have about blacks."
6. "They're important even if they are incompetent...They may provide much needed support and guidance to students who need that from someone. Some scholars may not provide this dimension. Ideally, the person will be both a scholar and a friend; this (is) where the most meaningful relationship is possible."

*Name withheld.

7. "They are of great importance now because most Blacks don't know who they are, where they want to go and why. They have identity problems because they give little thought to their real abilities and their logical job prospects."
8. "Critical. Without them lots of students are lost. This is especially important for younger, less mature students. This is true for both students coming from black and white institutions."
9. "While most Black and culturally diverse students are intellectually capable of completing advanced degrees, very few have the political sophistication necessary to move smoothly through the system. All but the most Anglo-centric and conforming will encounter political problems and all but the most hardened will suffer emotionally. A mentor can help students learn the hidden curriculum and also help them build their own personal power,"
10. "Mentors are very important because they represent the realization of your goals. Their presence makes it understood that you can succeed at your own endeavor."
11. "Having done graduate work at historically white institutions, I now see what I missed by not having a black faculty member in my department. Black students, in my opinion, need to see and work with black faculty in order to gain that 'something special' which could help bring about a stronger sense of community as well as sound direction.

    It's funny, but I would state that (my brother) is by far my mentor at this time. He is an additional source of support and without his guidance, I question my own direction."

12. "Extremely important. Only the very exceptional student can navigate the bureaucracy alone without mentoring/ guidance."
13. "To me mentors are crucial for success. So often we miss the subtle issues because we are not in the mainstream of information about jobs, research support, general opportunities and normative expectations."
14. "Mentors are very important. My first advisor was totally unsupportive. Although I had a strong academic record, I never received anything but criticism from that person. In part, because of him, I left school after completing my Masters. I returned two years later, got a new advisor, avoided the old one, and had no problem completing my doctorate."
15. "Very important! If one does not have a mentor while in school he may never complete the requirements. This has been true in more than one case at the University of Michigan."
16. "Mentors are very important, especially in getting the first job. The question is always asked: Tell me about "X" student. How a mentor answers this question is very important."
17. "Extremely important. With a lack of a faculty mentor, black graduate populations will continue to decline."

18. Very important! This is why at predominantly white institutions every effort should be made to have black faculty. I strongly feel that a mentor is of the utmost importance in one's graduate education."
19. Of extreme importance. It makes a difference to have a mentor who is black. To be able to surmise that, 'if she/he made it -- so can I,' is the best thing that can happen to a black graduate student."

There were also those persons who compared the need for mentors among the present generation of black students and the lack of their need among older age cohorts of black graduate or professional students. Three statements may illustrate this point:

1. A pre-1950 graduate stated: "They were not especially important to me and my contemporaries; however, it seems to be much more important for today's black students. They seem to need more support in order to get through school."
2. A 1950-59 graduate commented: "When I was in grad school, mentors were not important. Today, black students seek mentors and I serve as such", and a 1960-69 graduate stated:
3. "Generally I think (they are) very important. However, I do think we tend to put too much emphasis on finding a single mentor."

On balance, then, the participants in this study felt that mentors are of special value to blacks and other minority students during their period of study in graduate or professional schools. In explaining this importance, the respondents amplified many of the special functions attributed to true mentors. Unfortunately, such a small number of them actually experienced the type of mentoring desired.

In addition to the hypotheses that were advanced for investigation in this study, an effort was made to ascertain whether or not mentoring is empirically related to several variables presumed to influence mentoring. For instance, no confirmation was found to support assumptions that mentoring for black graduate or professional school students is related to the age of the mentor, or affiliation or racial characteristics of the institution from which the graduate or professional degree was obtained (i.e., public or private and black versus white), or sex of the mentor, or race of the mentor.

With respect to the race of the "most important person in graduate or professional school," however, the findings in this study revealed that the participants were more likely to name a white male (46.8%) than any other person. Black males (30.5%) were identified second and black females were third since 12.1% of the respondents stated that they were their most important persons during that period (Table 40).

Table 40. Most Important Person in Graduate/Professional School
By Race, Sex, Number and Percent

Race and Sex	N	%
Black Female	17	12.1
White Female	12	8.5
Black Male	43	30.5
White Male	66	46.8
Other Male Minority	1	.7
Combination of Above	2	1.4
Total	141	100.0

The fact that white males were selected as the most important person may indeed suggest that they are often characterized as role models for black students, or that they perform invaluable services for them. It may also be further evidence of the underrepresentation of blacks, male or female, on the teaching faculties of predominantly white colleges and universities. If so this situation underscores the importance of increasing a larger presence of black faculty and administrators in higher education.

Age of Most Important Person: Although the relationship between the age of the mentor and rank on the mentor scale was not statistically significant, age differences were reported by the respondents. More than a fifth of the respondents reported that their most important person was slightly older than they (22.2%). One-third stated that the person was from 10 to 19 years older. Slightly more than one-fourth reported that such persons were at least twenty years older than they. Only one in six stated that such individuals were about the same age as they. Only three persons stated that the most important person to them while in graduate or professional school was actually younger than they (Table 41).

Table 41. Age of Most Important Person in Graduate or Professional School by Number and Percent

Age Category	N	%
Younger than I	3	2.1
About Same Age	23	16.0
Slightly Older	32	22.2
10-19 Years Older	46	33.3
20 or More Years Older	38	26.4
Total	144	100.0

Mentoring and Strength of Ties: The relationship between the mentor and Ties scale is statistically significant. The higher the score on the mentoring scale the more likely were individuals to score high on the Ties scale (Table 42 shows that 23.1% of the respondents who scored strong on the Ties scale scored at the "mentor" level on the mentor scale; 35.9% scored at the "sponsor" level, and 41.0% scored at the "advisor/teacher/peer" level on the mentor scale. Of the 107 persons who scored "average" on the Ties scale, 10.3% had mentors, 52.3% had sponsors, and 37.4% named advisors/teachers/peers as their most important person during graduate or professional school. By contrast, of the eleven persons who scored "weak" on the Ties scale, none had mentors; 9.1% had sponsors, and 90.9% identified advisors/teachers/peers as their most important person during graduate or professional school. Apparently, those respondents who had mentors were also those persons whose personality attributes enabled them to establish stronger interpersonal relationships and social bonds with their peers. These traits may have been transferred to relationships with their most important person which ultimately facilitated the development of a mentoring relationship between them.

Table 42. Relationship between Mentoring and Ties

Rank on Mentor Scale	Rank on Ties Scale						Row Total	
	Strong		Average		Weak			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Mentor	9	23.1	11	10.3	0	0	20	12.7
Sponsor	14	35.9	56	52.3	1	9.1	71	45.2
Advisor/Teacher Peer	16	41.0	40	37.4	10	90.9	66	42.0
Column Total	39	24.8	107	68.2	11	7.0	157	100.0

Chi Square = 17.11; DF = 4; Significance = .001

Mentoring notwithstanding, of all the variables identified with respect to success after graduation, respondents attributed most of their career success to their own personal abilities and roles performed by members of their own families. More than three fourths (78%) rated personal ability first in importance while only 4.5% stated that that variable was of little or no importance in their own career advancement. Slightly more than half (52.8%) rated family members as "first" while 13.3% stated that family members were of little or no importance along this dimension. Essentially then, these respondents claim that their success can be more accurately accounted for not by the help and influence of others, such as mentors, advisors, sponsors, friends, and professional colleagues, but by their own abilities and the assistance or support of family members.

While the latter factors may be largely responsible for their success, other important questions are raised. For instance, have other blacks been in a position to be of assistance to them and could not or would not? Have important persons, whether mentors, sponsors or advisors, been reluctant to support and promote the career advancement of black students, and is this more likely in the case of black than among white students? Is it possible that other black or white mentors have paved the way for their success, without the knowledge of the respondent? Have others actually and actively promoted the respondent in ways that led to their career advancement that make respondents less willing to acknowledge the power, influence and contributions of those who have facilitated that career advancement? Is it psychologically more soothing or of greater ego enhancement to assign primacy of achievement to the self and to deny that others may have been immense help in whatever success achieved? Each of these is a possiblity. Each is an empirical question that is worthy of further investigation.

Suggested Hypotheses on Mentoring

Although a number of hypotheses concerning correlates of mentoring were tested in this exploratory study, these and additional hypotheses may be subjected to further empirical investigations. Additional hypotheses include the following:

1. Irrespective of institutional type, that is public or private, black students encounter greater difficulty than do white students in obtaining a mentor.
2. Irrespective of race, graduate or professional students are less likely to participate in a mentor-protegé relationship and more likely to be involved in a relationship that is less intense than mentoring.
3. The closer the potential protegé is to the mentor in socio-economic standing or origin the more likely is the potential protege to be selected for mentoring.
4. The greater the number of black professors, within a given department or professional school, the more likely are black graduate or professional school students to be paired with a black professor as the mentor. Conversely, the smaller the number of black professors in a department or a professional school, the less likely are black students to participate in the mentor-protegé relationship.
5. Irrespective of race, women are less likely than men to participate in mentoring relationships.
6. Black women are less likely than black men, white men or white women to participate in the mentor-protegé relationship.

7. Whites who participated in the mentor-protegé relationship during their graduate or professional school years are more likely than black participants to be mentored by the same mentor for five years following graduation.
8. White students who had either mentors or sponsors during graduate or professional school are more likely than blacks who had mentors or sponsors to become incorporated into the mentor's network following graduation.
9. Upward mobility of blacks in their professions is less dependent upon sponsorship by mentors than upon other non-institutional factors.

CHAPTER VI
IMPLICATIONS

It should be evident from the findings of this exploratory study that much more should be known about networking and mentoring with respect to the experiences of black professionals. This point was highlighted at the conclusion of chapters IV and V with statements of several hypotheses generated by this research. However, a considerably expanded body of evidence could be constructed that could further illuminate the composition of networks over time and space, the nature of interaction between members of networks, the kinds of factors, situations and conditions that result in cohesive power of networks, the methods by which ideas and information are shared and, to use Homan's (1950) term, understand their "velocity of transmission."

While this research has demonstrated, interalia, the utility of networks for creating positive experiences of blacks during their graduate and professional school years, more research is still warranted to measure the effectiveness of these networks. Notions of effectiveness could be subjected to further empirical investigation by a more detailed examination of the degree to which networks established by blacks during that period remain essentially "egocentric" (i.e., between oneself and others) or "extended" (between different sets of networks). These are two possibilities raised by Granovetter (1974). If, indeed, their networks are extended or interlocking, what are the requisites for creating and reinforcing such important structures beyond those functions identified in this study.

Such questions have important and far-reaching implications for blacks who enroll in graduate or professional schools. For instance, armed with the knowledge of findings from empirical research, they should have critical insights into some of the requirements for career advancement beyond the acquisition of a graduate or professional degree. Specifically, they may have a broader understanding of the salience of network involvement, the importance of network ties and the ultimate value of reciprocity in the relationships they establish at that point in their development. It would be unnecessarily redundant to reiterate the processes for achieving the goal of strong networks. The narrative information, provided by respondents and reported in Chapter IV, has already spoken eloquently to that point. Their implications for black students are quite explicit.

Nevertheless, two points should be re-emphasized here. The first is that black students can no longer afford to be reticient or reluctant about reaching out to others. They must become even more assertive than ever before toward the establishment of both egocentric and extended networks. If a major purpose of networks extends beyond mere "survival" through the graduate or professional school experience toward success in their chosen careers, then, it is incumbent upon them to identify and move toward the centers of power and influence, whether black or white or other minority in composition. Simultaneously, this research suggests that a mechanism has to be found by which those relationships and linkages constructed between blacks, other minorities, and whites can transcend calculated superficiality. The viability of social, occupational and political and educational networks will depend largely upon the strength, positive dimensions, genuineness and duration of both the acquaintance volume of one time period toward increasing effectiveness into other time frames and special conditions.

The second point is simply that, if we do indeed recognize the need for greater exposure and participation of black students in various networks, black faculty may be required to perform facilitating roles toward that end. Assuming that black faculty and administrators have at least a minimum of access to decision-making processes (and often they do not), they may enhance student knowledge about that process and identify the key actors instrumental in decision-making. They may also assist black students in finding creative ways to operationalize what they will come to learn about the processes vital to network building and maintenance.

This study also has important and explicit implications for the mentoring process. Given the number of respondents who reported that there were no blacks teaching in their institutions or in their major departments, it is imperative that graduate and professional schools become far more aggressive in the recruitment, hiring and tenuring of black faculty. That aggressiveness must also extend to the recruitment, hiring, and retention of black administrations into positions of power and influence. Clearly, many white professors have served effectively as mentors and sponsors of black students but the number of blacks in these roles should be increased. A larger number of black professionals in graduate and professional schools expands the options available to all students, irrespective of race or ethnicity. One way to communicate to outsider groups that they have a shot at success is to provide visible role models of success for them. One method of combatting demeaning stereotypes about minority groups is to hire members from those groups into important positions (in colleges and universities, too), and in such large numbers that their accomplishments may undermine the stereotypical beliefs that many key decision-makers, some faculty/administrators and students may hold about such groups. If they are hired in sufficient numbers, then, it makes it much more difficult to regard those special talents found in minority group members as "exceptions" to their group and to make it easier to conclude that special talent may be "exceptional" for any category of persons.

Another critical observation that may be made from this study is that black students do not participate as fully in the mentoring process as many would either think or desire. Since the focus of this study was exclusively toward the experiences of black Americans, we have no compartive body of data that sheds similar light on the experiences of white students. It may be shown through further empirical investigations that, in fact, no racial differences can be determined with respect to mentoring. That is to say, neither black nor white students are likely to have mentors in any large measure during that period of their lives. Further research may also substantiate an implication of this study that, indeed, someone else is being exposed to a greater magnitude of mentoring functions since only 12.7% of blacks are.

While this study has identified and stressed mentoring functions and some of the qualitative dimensions of mentoring, much more knowledge should be garnered about the developmental aspects of mentoring. We also need more knowledge about mentoring as a process.

Irrespective of those considerations, it seems evident that institutional policies and practice should be transformed, if not overhauled, so that black students will have a better chance at being selected to serve in roles that expose them to potential mentors. Specifically, the policies and practices governing access and selection for teaching assistantships, research and clinical assistantships, the awarding of post-doctoral fellowships, and the awarding of travel grants to graduate or professional students in order to participate in the local, regional and national meetings of their disciplines or fields of study need to be transformed. If blacks are not selected for participation in such roles, their opportunities for participation in the mentoring process are diminished significantly.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bardolph, Richard
1970
The Civil Rights Record: Black Americans and the Law, 1849-1970. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Berrian, Albert H.
1982
"Toward Desegregation and Enhancement," PP. 138-152 in Reginald Wilson (ed.), Race and Equity in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Blackwell, James E.
1975
The Black Community: Diversity and Unity. New York: Harper and Row.

1976
Maurice Jackson and Joan Moore
"The Status of Minority Groups in Sociology," FOOTNOTES (Special Supplement). Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

1977
"Social Factors Affecting Educational Opportunity for Minority Students," Pp. 1-19 in The College Board (ed.), Beyond Desegregation. New York: The College Board.

1981
Mainstreaming Outsiders: The Production of Black Professionals. Bayside, N.Y.: General Hall, Inc.

1982
"Demographics of Desegregation," Pp. 28-70 in Reginald Wilson (ed.) Race and Equity in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Blalock, Hubert M.
1972
Social Statistics. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Blau, Peter M. and Otis Dudley Duncan
1967
The American Occupational Structure. New York: Free Press.

Bucher, R. and Sterling, J.
1977
Becoming Professionals. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing Company.

Cameron, Susan and Robert Blackburn
1981
"Sponsoring and Academic Career Success," Pp. 369-377 in Journal of Higher Education. 52 (July-August).

Carter, Ann L.
1979
"Black Americans and Education: An Historical Perspective,": Journal of NAWDAC. (Winter).

College and University Personnel Association
Women and Minorities in Administration of Higher Education Institutions. Washington, D.C.: College and University Personnel Association.

Collins, Eliza and Patricia B. Scott 1978	"Everyone Who Makes It Has A Mentor," Pp. 89-101 in Harvard Business Review. (July-August).
de Solla, Price D. and Beaver, D. 1966	"Collaboration in an Invisible College," Pp. 1011-1018 in American Psychologist. 21 (November).
Edwards, Harry 1970	Black Students. New York: Free Press,
Epstein, A. 1969	"The Network of Urban Social Organization," Pp. 116-132 in J. C. Mitchell (ed.) Social Networks in Urban Situations. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Epstein, Cynthia 1971	A Woman's Place. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
1973	"Positive Effects on the Multiple Negatives: Explaining the Success of Black Professional Women," Pp. 912-925 in American Journal of Sociology. 78:4.
Forcese, Dennis P. and Stephen Richer (eds.) 1970	States of Social Research: Contemporary Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
Fowler, Deborah L. 1982	"Mentoring Relationships and the Perceived Quality of the Academic Work Environment,": Pp. 27-33 in Journal of NAWDAC. (Spring).
Granovetter, Mark 1973	"Strength of Weak Ties," Pp. 1360-1380 in American Journal of Sociology. 78 (May).
1974	Getting A Job: A Study of Contacts. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
1976	"Network Sampling: Some First Steps," Pp. 1287-1303 in American Journal of Sociology. 81:6.
Green, Madeline F. 1982	"A Washington Perspective on Women and Networking: The Power and the Pitfalls," Pp. 17-21 in Journal of NAWDAC. (Fall).
Greenberg, Jack 1959	Race Relations and the American Law. New York: Columbia University Press.
Hall, O., Scott, W.R. and E.H. Volkart (eds.) 1966	Medical Care. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Henning, M. and Jardim, A. 1977 — The Managerial Woman. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/ Doubleday.

Hochschild, A. 1974 — "Making It: Marginality and Obstacles to Minority Consciousness," Pp. 194-199 in B. Kundsin, Women and Success. New York: William Morrow.

Homans, George 1950 — The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss

1977a — Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books.

1977b — "Some Effects of Proportions on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women," American Journal of Sociology. 82:965-990.

Kanter, Rosabeth and Cynthia Fuchs Epstein 1970 — "Encountering the Male Establishment: Sex Limits on Women's Careers in the Professions," Pp. 965-82 in American Journal of Sociology. 75:6.

Klopf, Gordon J. 1982 — "The Case for Mentors," Pp. 34-35 in The Educational Digest. 1:4 (January).

Javonovich, Joann and Sharyn L. Tanguay 1980 — "Networking," Pp. 30-34 in Journal of Placement. (Fall).

Levinson, Daniel 1978 — The Seasons of A Man's Life. New York: Ballentine Books.

Lynch, Susan M. 1980 — "The Mentor Link: Bridging Education and Employment," Pp. 44-47 in Journal of College Placement. (Fall).

Milgram, Stanley 1967 — "The Small-World Problem," Pp. 62-67 in Psychology Today. 1 (May).

Miller, Thomas E. and Susan Brinkman 1982 — "Faculty and Staff Mentoring: A Model for Improving Student Retention and Service," Pp. 23-27 in MAPA Journal.

Moore, Katheryn M. 1982 — "The Role of Mentors in Developing Leaders for Academe," Pp. 23-28 in The Educational Leader. 63 (Winter).

Morris, Lorenzo 1979 — Elusive Equality: The Status of Black Americans in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

Moses, Knolly 1980 — "Networking," Pp. 29-34 in Black Enterprise. 11 (September).

Nie, Norman A., et al. 1975
The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (2nd edition). New York: Mc Graw-Hill.

Pancrazio, Sally B. and Rosemarie G. Gray 1982
"Networking for Professional Women: A Collegial Model," Pp. 10-19 in Journal of NAWDAC. (Spring).

Phillips-Jones, Linda 1982
Mentors and Proteges. New York: Arbor House.

Pruitt, Anne S.
Black Employees in Traditionally White Institutions in the Adams States: 1975 to 1977. Atlanta: The Southern Education Foundation, 1981.

Reiss, Albert J. 1961
Occupations and Social Status. New York: Free Press.

Robertson, James 1980
"Black Student Satisfaction in the Deep South," Pp. 510-513 in Journal of College Student Personnel, (November).

Roche, Gerald R. 1979
"Much Ado About Mentors," Pp. 14-28 in Harvard Business Review. (January).

Selltiz, Claire, et al. 1976
Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Shapiro, Eileen C., Florence P. Haseltine and Mary P. Rowe 1978
"Moving Up: Role Models, Mentors and the Patron System," Pp. 51-58 in Sloan Management Review 19:3.

Simon, Julian L. 1976
Basic Research Methods in Social Sciences (2nd edition). New York: Random House.

Sjoberg, Gideon and Rober Nett 1968
A Methodology For Social Research. New York: Harper and Row.

Speizer, Jeanne J. 1981
"Role Models, Mentors, and Sponsors: The Elusive Concepts," Signs. (Summer).

Taylor , Irmgard and Marilou B. McLaughlin 1982
"Mentoring Freshmen Women," Pp. 10-15 in Journal of NAWDAC. (Winter).

Thomas, Gail, (ed.) 1981 Black Students in Higher Education: Conditions and Experiences in the 1970s. Westport, CT.: Greenwood Press.

Van Den Berg, Seif 1975 "Student Alienation: Orientations Toward and Perceptions of Aspects of Educational Structure," Pp. 262-276 in Urban Education. 10:3 (October).

Wheeler, Stanton 1966 "The Structure of Formally Organized Socialization Settings," Pp. 53-116 in Orville Brim, Jr., and Stanton Wheeler (eds.), Socialization After Childhood. New York: Wiley & Sons.

Willie, Charles V. and Arline McCord 1972 Black Students at White Colleges. New York: Praeger.

Wilson, Reginald 1982 Race and Equity in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

APPENDIX A

is the Study's Questionnaire

A copy of the questionnaire may be obtained by contacting

The Southern Education Foundation
811 Cypress Street N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

James E. Blackwell (A.B. and M.A., Western Reserve University, and Ph.D., Washington State University), has been Professor of Sociology at the University of Massachusetts/Boston since 1970. Previously, he held faculty positions at Case Western Reserve University, San Jose State University and Grambling State University. He also has been a visiting lecturer at universities in East Africa and Nepal. His major books include: MAINSTREAMING OUTSIDERS: THE PRODUCTION OF BLACK PROFESSIONALS (1981); CITIES, SUBURBS AND BLACKS (with Philip Hart, 1982); THE BLACK COMMUNITY: DIVERSITY AND UNITY (1975); BLACK SOCIOLOGISTS: HISTORICAL AND CONTEMPORY PERSPECTIVES (with Morris Janowitz, 1974) and COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FOCUS (with Boyd Faulkner, et al, 1971). In addition, he is the author of several research monographs, and has published many chapters in anthologies and textbooks and journal articles.

His participation in professional organizations include: President of the Society for the Study of Social Problems (1980-81),; President of the Eastern Sociological Society (1981-82),; Founding President of the Caucus of Black Sociologists (1970-72) and many committees of the American Sociological Association. In 1979, the American Sociological Association presented him with its Spivak Award "for systematic application of sociological knowledge to on-going social problems."